AN
ANSWE
To Doctor PIERCE's
ERMON
Preached before His MAJESTY at
HITE-HALL
Feb. 1. 1662.

By J. S.

persuasibilibus humanæ sapientiæ verbis, sed in osten-
spiritus & virtutis. 1 Cor. 2. 4.

Printed in the Year 1663.

AN

ANSWER

To Doctor PIERCE's

SERMON,

Preached before His MAJESTY at

WHITE-HALL,

Feb. 1. 1682.

By J. S.

Printed in the Year 1683.

70-1748

To the Queen Mother.

MADAM,

THere appeared of late at *Whitehall* a *Philistin* in black, defying the Armies of the living God. His strength was in his Tongue, not in his Arme: His weapons, Breath, and his combat, an houres Boast. Yet as to his own conceit, a huge *Goliah*: he blew down *Mount Sion* at a puffe, and split in pieces the Rock, against which the Gates of Hell shall never prevaile. In that conjuncture, because no adversary could securely be seen, the applause flew high, victory and triumph rebounding from all the hills of great *Britany*. Yet, God knowes, all was but wind: *Flaverunt venti*. The windes blew: *Sion* stands still immoveable, and the Rock unshaken. The blasts vanisht to nothing at the first joste against the House

of God, because it was founded up
Rock. This hath lately been demon
ted by the excellent Pen of S. C. cle
evincing the no less ancient, then
changeable truths of our Doctrines. B
indeed there needed no such Gyant to
feat that *Goliah*: the least of *Jesse*'s Fami
the Church, supported by the power
his Cause, may hope for successe in su
Duel. Upon which account I was enc
raged to trace out another way of answ
tending to disable his proofs, by stripp
his arguments, and shewing them in ev
Now the Doctor's Sermon having be
both Preached and published under
Royal shadow, I come with an humb
suit, prostrate at your Majesties feet; tha
may shelter this Answer under your gra
ous protection: whose name, as it is m
renowned in the Christian world, for ze
of Religion, so upon your Royall asse
will render all secure the Author of th
slender work.

Madam,

Your Majesties most hum
and ever devoted Serva

Aug. 1.

I. S.

Gentle Reader,

I Am onely to advertise thee of three things in the perusall of this Treatise. First, that Doctor Pierce having in his Dedicatory to the King, pretended to the publick confessions of our ablest Doctors, in favour of his errours, clogs both Margin and Text with our professt enemies: as Goldastus, Armacanus, John Hus, Hierome Prague, Chemnitius, Bishop Hall, Cook, Nilus, Balsamon, and others: or with Authors of suspected faith, whose works are forbidden by the Church, as Erasmus, Cassander, Thuanus, and Polidor Virgil de inventione rerum, enlarged and corrupted by Protestants: or if he cites any Orthodox Writers, they differ not in point of faith, but in things indifferent, or practises alterable upon just occasion. Secondly, that we alledge against them in our behalf, the very prime pillars of their pretended Church, as Luther, Calvin, Jewell, Whitaker, and the

like, and that not onely in matters of indif-ferency, but of the very substance of Faith. Thirdly, that Doctor Pierce knowing, that we for our belief rest onely upon the Churches definition, or interpretation of Scripture, as an infallible ground, and not upon this or that Schoolman, Historian, or Grammarians speeches, yet he hath wearied his sides in declaiming against us upon the fancied credit of a few private mens words, which were they truly cited, would weigh nothing with us to the main cause of Religion. Finally, I professe, my intent in this short work, to be, not so much a proof of our Catholick Doctrines, as to shew the unconvincing weaknesse of the Preacher's Arguments, which he mistakes for Demonstrations.

An Answer to Doctor *Pierce*'s Sermon, Preached before his Majestie at *White-hall*, Feb. 1. 1662.

SIR,

GIve me leave in the first place to tell you, that your application of our Saviours words: *From the beginning it was not so*, is no less confus'd, then unconcluding. Confus'd; as speaking in generall of a beginning, and not distinguishing what beginning, whether of time, order, institution, or what. Unconcluding; because it either overshoots, or falls short of the mark, proving too much, or nothing at all. For neither were all truths revealed, or all good practises in use from the beginning; nor all heresies, or corruptions, since the beginning.

2. You say *our Saviour was sent to reform the Jewes*: that is, not to found a new Law, but to renew the old; and that *he made known the rule of his reformation*: *From the beginning it was not so*. Well then; if you take the beginning from the birth of the World, as in Marriage, then the whole *Leviticus* will be either superstition, or profanation: for, *from the beginning it was not so*. The Devils denying God's veracity: *You shall not die*: Genes. 3.

Genes. 4. and *Adam*'s eating the forbidden fruit, or *Cain* murdering his Brother *Abel*, was not heresie, or corruption, for, *from the beginning it was so.*

3. If the rule begin with the Law it self, why should the adoring of the Golden Calf be superstition, since 'tis as old as the self same Law? why all that follow'd? as *David*'s Psalmes and Musick, the adding seven dayes to the Passeover by King *Ezechias*, 2 *Chron.* 30. 22. the *Encænia*, or Feast of Dedication, instituted by *Judas Machabæus*, kept and honoured by our Saviour, *Joan.* 10. 22. the reading of Scripture to the people every Sabbath day, *Act.* 13. 22. no superstition? since *from the beginning it was not so.*

4. If to reform Christian Churches you set up your *Pharos* with the precise beginning of the new Law; then (since nothing with you in point of Religion was from the beginning, but what is expresst in the Written word) the leaving to abstain from blood, and strangled things, commanded by the Apostles, as necessary: the use of the Crosse in Baptisme; the change of the Sabbath into Sunday; the Baptisme of Infants; the non-Rebaptization of Hereticks; the verball pronouncing the words in the form of Baptisme, as necessary to the validity of the Sacrament; the Degrees and Titles of Primates, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deanes, *&c.* will be superstition, errour, and profanation, for *from the beginning it was not so.* Then on the contrary, the *Saduces*, *Cerinthians*, *Nicolaits*, *Ebionits*, will not be Hereticks, (because they were from the beginning:) nay, nor the *Papists* neither, if as some

Learned

Learned *Protestants* affirm, Popery began under the Apostles. Therefore S. *Paul*, saith Doctor *Willet*, calleth Papistry *a mystery of iniquity, which began even to work in his dayes.* And Mr. *Middleton* b: *No marvel, though perusing Councils, Fathers and Stories, from the Apostles forward, we find the print of the Pope's feet.* And Mr. c *Perkins*: *Our Church ever hath been since the dayes of the Apostles, and that in the very midst of Papacy.* Insomuch that *Joannes Rheginus* d, a Learned *Protestant*, being press'd to shew a change in the *Roman* Church since the Apostles time, gives this desperate answer: *Though it were true, that the Roman Church had changed nothing in Religion, would it therefore presently follow, that she were a true Church? I think not.* A Learned thought indeed, supposing what S. *Paul* writes of the *Roman* Church in his dayes: *Your faith is renowned in the whole world*, Rom. 1.

a *Synopsis Contro. p. 76.*
b *Papistomastix, pag. 193.*
c *Reformed Catholick, pag. 616. Edit. 1616. in Folio.*
d *In lib. Apologet. p. 192.*

5. By this Rule forsooth so appli'd, all heresies and usurpations in both Lawes may be dispatcht. For though there is *hardly any of them in the Church, which may not truly pretend to some great antiquity*, even far beyond the Reformation: Yet because they are not *so old as the old max, much lesse as the old Serpent*, therefore they are convinc'd to be heresies and usurpations. Loe! how under the weight of this ponderous application, lie crush'd for ever all the modern ancient errours and corruptions, not onely of *Disciplinarians, Anabaptists, Socinians, Solifidians, Ranters, Millinarians, & Reprobatarians*, but most of all of the

the *Pontificians*: for they, like *Mahometans*, have a grand compound *of severall errours and corruptions, pretending indeed to some great antiquity*; yet bundled up in a new Creed, the Articles whereof, though as old as the new Law, yet not reaching to the dayes of the old Serpent, they make up a young Symbol, not passing the age of the Council of *Trent*.

6. Page 6. You fasten this Quotation upon our Learned Countryman, *Joannes Sarisburiensis*: *The Roman Church shewes her self towards others rather a Step-Mother then a Mother. There sit in her Scribes and Pharisees*: but how sincerely, the whole Chapter will discover. In which the Authour having related, how in a conference with *Adrian* the fourth at *Benevent* in *Italy*: the Pope askt him familiarly what men thought of the *Roman* Church. *I*, saith he, *using a holy freedome, laid open the evils that in divers Provinces I had heard. For as it was said by many: the Roman Church, which is the Mother of all Churches, shewes her self towards others, rather a Step-Mother then a Mother. There sit in her Scribes and Pharisees.* But then as to his own particular observation he solemnly professeth in these words: a *Yet one thing upon the testimony of my conscience I boldly professe, that I saw no where more honest Clergy, and who more detested avarice, then in the Roman Church*: and in relation to the Pope's authority, thus: b *He that dissents from your Doctrine,*

a *Unum tamen audacter, conscientia teste profiteor, quia nusquam honestiores Clericos vidi quam in Romana Ecclesia, aut qui magis avaritiam detestarentur.*

b *Qui à vestra doctrina dissentit, aut Hæreticus, aut Schismaticus est.*

Christ,

thine, is either an Heretick, or a Schismatick. Is not this very unhandsome dealing in a Preacher, first to omit wilfully those words: *As it was said by many*: and then to impose upon an Authour, what he only rehearseth out of other mens mouthes? secondly to skip over the words: *which is the Mother of all Churches*, wherein appears the judgement of Nations, as to the Primacy of the *Roman* Church. Thirdly, to conceale the Authour's own words, by which he expresselly declares a quite contrary sence to what you wrongfully charge him with? Good Reader ---*Crimine ab uno Disce omnes.*---

7. From your eight page till the sixteenth, you seem like *Euclid* in his First Book to speak principles undemonstrable, or with *Pythagoras* to exact your Auditors assent without reason upon αὐτὸς ἔφα, *he said it*. First you assert, but prove not, that the *point of Infallibility is the great Palladium of the Conclave*; as if the meeting and shutting up of the Cardinals to chuse a Pope, the usual notion of a *Roman Conclave*, were the same as the whole Catholick *Roman* Church: or the gift of infallibility in defining matters of Faith, were proper to the Cardinals without a Pope: A profound Erudition. Secondly, you assert without proof, that *the learned Members of the Roman Church swallow glibly so many errours, because they swallow this first, that she cannot erre.*

8. Like men in fear, [b] you strike first, knowing the blow to be unavoidable from us: that Protestants chop up so many errours, becauſe they first devour this, that, notwithstanding all Christs pro-

[b] *Tutissimum est inferre, cum times, pedem.* Sen.

miſes, the infallibility of the Apoſtles, and the ne-
ceſſity of that gift to preſerve her from errours, yet
the whole Church of Chriſt even in her greateſt re-
preſentatives can erre. Thirdly, you aſſert without
ground that the *point of Infallibility is an old Ar-
ticle of a new Creed.* Sir, there is no ſuch Creed
extant in the *Roman* Church. A profeſſion of
Faith, I admit, was appointed in a *Bull* by *Pius
Quartus* to be ſworn to by Paſtours of Souls, and
Profeſſours of Learning only: But if that be a new
Creed, much more will your thirty nine Articles
make up a new Creed, ſtuft with ſo many modern
negatives, & unto which not all, but ſome amongſt
you, were by your Statutes to ſubſcribe. But how-
ſoever: In your 8. article you receive and believe
3. Creeds; the Apoſtles Creed, *Nice* Creed, and
that of S. *Athanaſius*. Now I ask: theſe two laſt,
are they new Creeds, or no? if new ones, then the
Church has power to make new Creeds; if not,
why ſhould the Churches Declarations be call'd
new Creeds rather now, then in thoſe former times?
Fourthly, you aſſert quite *gratis*; that *in the
Council of Trent the Roman Partiſans were not
afraid to make new Articles of Faith.* As if to
declare explicitely to the faithfull ſuch verities, as
are contain'd implicitely or virtually in the writ-
ten word of God, or what traditionary Doctrines
are truly Divine, coming down from the Apoſtles
by never interrupted ſucceſſion of practice and be-
lief, were to make new Articles of Faith? Did the
Council of *Nice* make new Articles of Faith, when
it declared the celebration of *Eaſter*, or the vali-
dity

lity of *Baptisme* ministred by *Hereticks*, or the consubstantiality of the Sonne with the Father? what the Council of *Constantinople*, and S. *Athanasius* adde in their Creeds by way of declaration to the Apostles Creed, doth it speak new Articles of Faith? There was a time when some Canonical Books were not *de fide obligante*, of necessary belief, as the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and that of S. *James*, &c. are they now after the Churches acceptation, new Articles of Faith? And yet be those justly anathematized, who deny any one of the aforesaid points so declared? Why then might not the Council of *Trent* upon occasion of emergent Heresies, declare anew, what was to be held about the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, *Purgatory*, *Invocation* of Saints, Worship of *Images*, and the like? and yet no more *in contempt of the Apostles denuntiation*, Gal. 1. 8. then the definitions of former Generall Councils? When did the Church forfeit the power of defining? St. *Paul*'s *Anathema* strikes at you *Protestants*, who adde your negative Articles contrary to the word of God, not at the Church which declares what is truly revealed in it.

9. What you say here about the time when the denial of Marriage to Priests began: of the date of *Transubstantiation*, *half-Communion*, *publick prayer in an unknown tongue*, *and the Pope's Supremacy*, shall be answered in your Demonstrations.

10. You abuse very disingenuously the learned Cardinal *Bellarmine*, in saying, first, that he boasted of the antiquity of *Purgatory*; where as in the places you quote, there is not a syllable of

that

that humour; only this modest expression, *we do not find the beginning of this Doctrine: but all the Ancients both Greek and Latine from the very time of the Apostles, constantly taught that there is a Purgatory.* Secondly, that *Bellarmine* could not give an older instance then *Origen* and *Tertullian*; a most palpable untruth: for *Bellarmine* in his tenth Chapter, cited by your self, expressly alledged, for *Purgatory*, S. *Clement* the Roman, and S. *Dennis*, both Coetaneans to the Apostles; and though in his Book *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, *Bellarmine* seems to doubt of that work of S. *Clement*, yet he constantly defends S. *Dennis*'s Books. Perhaps because these two were never noted of errour, you skipt them over to fasten upon *Origen* and *Tertullian*, thinking to discredit their authority by advancing their lapses. But, sweet Sir, have *Origen* and *Tertullian* forfeited their credit since the conference of Divines at *Hampton Court* before King *James*? there Dr. *Reynolds* scrupling at the use of the *Cross*, the Dean of *Westminster*, saith *Baker*, *shewed out of Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, and others, that in their time it was used: And this the King judged antiquity enough to warrant the continuance of it still.* Was *Tertullian* no *Montanist*, when in your third Page he is cited to your purpose; and is he one now in your eight Page, when *Bellarmine* cites him to ours: nay, and shall be Orthodox again in your thirty one page, when he is fancied to make against us? Is *Origen* in your eighth page not onely an Heretick, but an Arch-Heretick, and therefore

In vita Jacobi Regis:

before of no authority, when he is brought by *Bellarmin* for Purgatory? but will be Orthodox a-, when in your 27. page you call for him againſt ayers in an unknown tongue? Yet this very ſtrength oves Purgatory the more: for if their Doctrine of rgatory had been erroneous, or heretical, the Fa-ers and Councils, that ſpared them not for other reſies, would queſtionleſſe have cenſur'd them for , which never any one did. Thirdly, that the Cardinal having boaſted of all the Ancients, both Greek and Latin, down from the Apoſtles could not make it good, but by recourſe to the Heathens, as *Plato*, *Gorgias*, *Cicero*, *Virgil*; as if thoſe Heathens were alledged in the ſame Chapter, as holy Fathers of Chriſtian times, to prove the doctrine of Purgatory from the Apoſtles, albeit they lived long before the Apoſtles dayes. Yet not to be taken tripping, in your margin you cite alſo *Bellarmin*'s 2d. Chapter, which nothing concerns either Authorities of Fathers, or the age of Purgatory. In this Chapter the Cardinal relating divers errours about Purgatory, alledges S. *Auſtin*, who in his 31. book of the City of God, the 13. chap. affirms it to have been the Platonicks opinion, that all puniſhments after death were but purging pains; and to that effect S. *Auſtin* cites *Virgil*. To this *Bellarmin* replies, that in *Plato*'s works, as in his Dialogues intituled *Phædon & Gorgias*, 3. ſorts of men are ſentenc'd after death: the firſt to the *Elyſian* Fields; the ſecond, whoſe ſins are curable, to temporary pains: the third, of ſins incurable, to eternal. Afterwards in the 11. chapter, amongſt other proofs drawn from reaſon, *Bellarmin* ſayes, that Purgatory was the ſence of all Nations,

Jewes, *Mahometans*, & *Gentils*, both *Philosophers* & *Poets*; and proves it out of the *Machabees*, *Alcoran*, *Plato*, *Cicero*, and *Virgil*. Finally, to prevent your cavils, he concludes; that things wherein all Nations agree, can hardly spring, but from the light of Nature; whil'st other inventions forged by men, will ever alter, as Nations are divers. In all this discourse, where is there any recourse to Heathens to make up the antiquity of Purgatory from the Apostles? In the margin you bid us see *Bellarmine* contradicted by the *Romanists* themselves, and then you cite a work of *Polydor Virgil*, corrupted and Printed at *Basil* amongst the Sectaries, and forbidden by the Church. *Roffensis* onely intends, that the name and nature of Purgatory was but very seldome mentioned amongst the ancientest *Greeians*. But for the thing it self he sayes expresly, *Art.* 37. *Whereas Purgatory is affirmed by so many both Greek and Latine Fathers, 'tis not likely, but that the truth of it, was made clear unto them by some sufficient proof*. *Thomas ex Albiis* neither denies Purgatory, nor the Authority of Fathers, but onely the manner of purging Soules before the Resurrection. *Suarez* in the place you quote, hath not a word of this matter. And whether they contradict *Bellarmine* or no, they all contradict you, and assert Purgatory.

Cum a tot Patribus tam Graecis quàm Latinis Purgatorium affirmetur, non est verisimile, quin ejus veritas per idoneas probationes illis clarui sset.

11. Not content with abusing *Bellarmine*, you treat the great S. *Austin* himself most unworthily, perswading your Auditours, that he denied Invocation of Saints to have been in his dayes: a thing so manifestly false, that *Protestants* themselves acknowledge the contrary. *I confesse*, saith Doctor

Fulk in his rejoynder to *Bristow*, page 5. *that Ambrose, Austin and Hierome, held invocation of Saints.* And Mr. *a Brightman* after he had named *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, *Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Hierome*, *Austin*, he rebukes them, *as in words condemning Idolatry, but indeed establishing it by invocation of Saints.* Lastly, *b Chemnitius* alledgeth S. *Austin*, craving *S. Cyprian's* Prayers (*adjuvet itaque nos in orationibus* ;) and then excuses him, saying, *these things did S. Austin without Scripture, yielding to the time and custome.* But let us hear S. *Austin* himself, giving the reason why Christians did willingly bury their deareſt friends near the Martyrs Tombes: *dum recolunt*, saith he, *whil'st they call to mind where the bodies of those that are dear to them, are laid, they with their prayers commend them to the same Saints, as it were to Patrons*, &c. And in his 33. *d* Sermon *de diversis*, he relates how a Woman had recourse to S. *Stephen* for her Son newly dead, praying, *Holy Martyr Restore me my Son.* Let any one read S. *Austin's* eight Chapter of the 22. Book *de Civitate Dei*, and if obstinacy doth not blind him, he will be convinc'd of *S. Austin's* mind. But you Sir, to colour the cheat, cite his words in *Latine*, omitting what is most material. Take his whole Text as it lies. The Saint therefore to shew that Christians do not honour the Martyrs of God, as the *Heathens* did their gods, who were but dead men, as *Hercules* and *Romulus*, speaks thus: *e* *They* (the *Heathens*) *built Temples, erected Al-*

a Apocalip. c. 14. p. 382.

b Part. 3. examin. pag. 197. edit. 1614. Lib. 5. Cont. Donatistas, cap. 1.

c De cura pro mort. cap. 4.

d Tomo 10. edit. Parisiensi. anno 1635.

e Lib. 22. de civit. Dei, cap. 10.

tars, appointed Priests, and offered Sacrifices to these their Gods: but we build no Temples to our Martyrs, as to Gods, but Monuments as to dead men, whose spirits live with God. Nor do we set up Altars there, whereon to sacrifice to the Martyrs; we offer Sacrifice to the one God both of Martyrs and ours: at which Sacrifice as men of God, who in confessing him, overcame the world, they are nominated in their due place and order; yet are they not invocated by the Priest, that Sacrificeth, for he Sacrificeth to God, not to them, although at their Monuments; because he is God's not their Priest. By this Text intirely cited, is it not evident, that S. *Austin* in those words: *Yet are they not invocated by the Priest, that Sacrificeth,* (which you quote, and there make a stop) meaneth a Religious invocation due to God alone? as his reason evinces; *For he Sacrificeth to God,* (saith the Saint,) *not to them, because he is God's, not their Priest.* And [f] against *Faustus* the *Manichæan* he farther declares, wherein this high invocation consists, *Which of the Priests* (saith he) *serving at the Altar in place of the holy Bodies, ever said at any time, We offer unto thee O Peter, Paul, Cyprian?* This therefore is the invocation which S. *Austin* denyes to Saints.

[f] Lib. 20. cap. 21.

13. Your errour is inexcusable in deriving the *Catholick* Churche's infallibility in matters of Faith, either from *Gnosticks* or Disciples of *Marcus*; whilest you might know that holy Scripture, Councils, Fathers, and reason convinces the contrary. *Quæ conventio Christi & Belial?* what re-

lation

lation hath Christs promises, *his spirit of truth abiding for ever, and teaching his Church all truthts*, making it the *house of the living God, Pillar and Firmament of truth*; with the filthy errours and practises of those beastly Hereticks. A Preacher of the Word of God should abhorre all, but especially such abominable untruths.

Ioan 14.

1 Tim. 3.

14. *Irenaus* in the Book and Chapter you quote, having said that *Marcus* had a Devil at his elbow, by whose whispers he prophesied, and imparted that gift to Women fit for his purpose, *because his chief businesse was with Women* μάλιστα περὶ γυναῖκας ἀσχολεῖται; addes, that his Disciples driving the same trade, *by deceits corrupted many silly women, giving themselves out for perfect men, as if none upon earth, neither Peter nor Paul could match them for knowledge.* Is not this a perfect character of *Luther* and his Disciples, your Reformers? They had Devils at their eares, by a *Luther*'s and b *Zwinglius*'s confession; they lusted insatiably after women, broke vowes of chastity, seduced silly Virgins, corrupted Nunnes, and boasted of their abilities above the whole Church, even the Apostles c *The Gospel is so copiously preached by us, that truly in the Apostles time it was not so clear*, saith *Martin Luther*. And again, l *What arguments soever the ancient Orthodox Fathers, the Schooles of Divines, the authority of Councils and Popes, the consent of ages, and of all the Christina people can help you to, lay them all aside. We admit nothing but Scriptures; and so, that with us alone is the certain authority of interpreting: what we*

Ἐξαπατώντες γυναικάρια πολλὰ διέφθηραν.

a De Missa privata Tom. 7. fol. 443.

b Tom. 2. lib. de Euchar. fol. 249.

c Tom. 7. Serm. de Evers. Hierusalem.

l Lib. de Servo arbitrio contra Erasmum edit. prior.

 interpret,

interpret, that is the ſenſe of the holy Ghoſt: what others bring, though they be many and great men, comes from the Spirit of Satan, and a diſtracted brain. This indeed is to be *Marciſts* and *Gnoſticks*.

15. 'Tis alſo an affected errour, to ſay we take our Purgatory from *Origen* and *Tertullian*; doth not *Bellarmin* prove it out of Scripture, alledging near twenty Texts, ſo expounded by the ancient Fathers? Nay, doth not your own *Chemnitius* confeſſe, that *Dioniſius* the *Areopagite* mentions Prayer for the Dead? Do's not your Doctor *Fulk* plainly averre, that *Tertullian, Cyprian, Auſtin, Hierome, and a great many more do witneſſe*, that Sacrifice for the Dead is the Tradition of the Apoſtles? Inſomuch that *Zwinglius* being urged with the authority of S. *Chryſoſtome* and S. *Auſtin*, deriving that cuſtome from the Apoſtles, gives this wild anſwer: *If it be ſo, as Auſtin and Chryſoſtome report, I think the Apoſtles ſuffered ſome to pray for the Dead for no other cauſe, then to condeſcend to their infirmity.* But what if the firſt mention of Purgatory were found in *Origen* and *Tertullian*, who lived in the beginning of the third age? was it therefore a dreame of their own brain? or an Hereſie of *Montanus*, as if he could commend nothing but errours? Did not the Fathers of all enſuing ages follow that Doctrine without contradiction? and the whole Church of God embrace it as comming from the Apoſtles? *Hoc enim à patribus traditum univerſa obſervat Eccleſia*, ſaith S. *Auſtin: This the univerſal Church obſerves as delivered by the Fathers.*

Exami. part. 3. p. 90. Edit. 1614.

Againſt Purgat. p. 302.

Tomo 1. Epicher. de can. Miſſe. fol. 186.

De verbis Apoſtoli c. 34.

16. Thirdly,

16. Thirdly, you erre prodigiously, in affirming that your Reformers in *England* discovered in the *Roman* Church *horrible corruptions in point of practice, and hideous errours in point of Doctrine; and that in matter of faith too*, whereas hitherto no *Protestant* in the world hath ever been able to shew any one such errour, or corruption. What you can discover, shall appear hereafter in your goodly Demonstrations.

17. You adde to that another grosse errour: that those blessed Reformers *found by what degrees the severall errours & corruptions were slily brought into the Church, as well as the severall times wherein the Novelties received their birth and breeding*. But, good Mr. *Pierce*, how often have you *Protestants* been challeng'd to shew, when any such Novelties against faith or manners sprung up in the Church, and yet could never doe it? How often have you been told, that the *Roman* Church was once a true and pure Church, *Rom.* 1. and that if it fell, it must be either by Apostasie, Heresie, or Schisme? Not by Apostasie, because she believes in Christ: If by Heresie, what lawfull Council, what Fathers, what other Church of Christ ever censur'd or condemn'd her? If by Schisme, from what other true Church did she ever separate? name that Church as distinct from the *Roman*, if you can. For I [a] suppose, that in a Schisme, the rent or wound cannot be mortall to both parts, least Christ should have no Church at all upon earth. And because such a Church different from the *Roman* cannot possibly be found,

[a] *Omnes hæreses exierunt abilla tanquam sarmenta inutilia recisa de vite sed illa manet in sua radice & in sua vite, S. Aug. de Symb. ad Catechu. lib. 1. cap. 5.*

therefore ſome of your Learned *Proteſtants* ingenuouſly confeſſe it. *We cannot tell*, ſaith Doctor *Powell, by whom, or at what time the enemy did ſow*, (the Papiſts Doctrine) &c. *neither indeed doe we know who was the firſt Authour of your blaſphemous opinions.* And Doctor *Fulk* in his Rejoynder to *Briſtow*, p. 265. anſwering the ſame queſtion about the change of the *Roman* Church, ſaith, *I anſwer; my Text ſaith it was a myſtery not revealed, and therefore could not be at firſt openly Preached againſt.* 'Tis alſo the confeſſion of Doctor *Whitaker* in his anſwer to *Campian*, that *the time of the Roman change cannot eaſily be told.* And yet this pittifull ſhift is clearly againſt that renowned rule of S. *Auſtin*, in his 118. Epiſtle and elſewhere: that what is held by the Univerſall Church, and not known when it began, is to be believed as an Apoſtolicall Tradition: By which maxime Doctour *Whitgift* proves againſt *Cartwright*, that the names of Metropolitan, Arch-Biſhop, *&c.* have their originall from the Apoſtles. 'Tis alſo againſt evident reaſon: for if Chriſts Spirit of Truth abiding alwayes with the Church, could permit errours in faith to creep into it unperceptibly; ſuch errours even by the principles of Chriſtianity, would be irreformable. For if they were brought in ſo ſlily that their beginning could not be obſerved, nor they perceived till they were univerſally received in the Church: whoſoever ſhould attempt to reform them, muſt by the principles of Chriſtianity be held for an Heretick, becauſe he oppoſeth the whole Church of Chriſt, and ſo were

Conſiderat. of the Papiſts Supplication, p. 43.

Reſponſ. ad Rat. 7. Campiani.

Defence, &c. p. 351.

were to be thrown out as a Heathen and a Publican. For *to dispute against the whole Church is most insolent madness*, saith S. *Austin* Ep. 118.

18. You erre no lesse absurdly, when you say, that in the fourth Session of the Council of *Trent*, *the Roman Church is made to differ as well from her ancient and purer self, as from all other Churches besides her self.* This is meerly begg'd, and not prov'd. Might not all former Heretickes have said the same of all Generall Councils that condemn'd them? Did either the Council of the Apostles, *Act.* 15. or the first four Generall ones make the Church differ from her self by reason of their Definitions or Decrees? why then the Council of *Trent* in particular? Because, say you, that Council defin'd *many meerly humane writings, and many unwritten Traditions to be of equal authority with the Scripture*: anathematizing all that should not receive them. The Council of *Trent* defined no writings to be of equal authority with the Scriptures, but such, as those Orthodox Fathers by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, confirming ancient Tradition, judged to be the word of God: nor any unwritten Traditions, but such as were either immediately received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or inspired to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost, and so handed down in a perpetuall succession unto them. Of such Traditions the Apostle speaks, 2 *Thes.* 2. *Hold the Traditions which you have been taught, whether by word or Epistle. Hence it is clear*, saith S. *Chrysostome*, *that the Apostles delivered not all things*

Sess. 4. *Quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usq; pervenerunt.* Upon that place.

things by writing, but many things also unwritten, both which are worthy of equall belief. Is not this the very Definition of the Council of *Trent*? And might not all the Hereticks that ever deny'd any part of Scripture, as the *Cerinthians* deny'd the whole New Testament but S. *Matthew*'s Gospell, the *Marcionists*, *Gnosticks*, & *Manichees* all the old Testament, as *Luther* the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, S. *James*, and the *Apocalyps*: and all that ever deny'd Apostolicall Traditions, as *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutyches* and other Novellers did; might not, I say, all these have used the same plea against the Church, or Councils that defined Canonicall Books, or Apostolicall Traditions against them? A strange objection, and stranger Reformation, that justifies all Hereticks in the world! As for the anathema, hath it not ever been the Style of all Generall Councils, to lay a curse upon the refusers of their Definitions? And if the point of Infallibility was both believed and virtually defined by the first Generall Councils, justly imposing upon mens consciences an inward assent to their Decrees of Faith, upon pain of Anathema: why not as well by the Council of *Trent*?

19. But I wonder what you mean, in saying that the Roman Church was made to differ from all other Churches besides her self. If by the Roman Church you mean not onely the City and Diocesse of *Rome*, but all other Churches (united with that particular Church) whose Bishops sate and voted in the Council of *Trent*; then you speak a *Chymera*, there being but one true Catholick Church in

in the world, which is the Roman, that never differ'd from her self in matters of Faith: except you intend a Heterogenial Church patcht up of all condemn'd Sects in the world opposite one to another.

20. Upon the premises, your Reformers, say you, *met together*, and concluded a Secession. As if *Protestants* revolted not from the *Pope* long before the Council of *Trent* or the pretended new Creed, as you call it. But let us see the quality of those Reformers: to wit, *your Kings, your Clergy, & your Layty too*. What Kings I pray? *Hen.* the 8. the first broacher of the Schism, with *Dalila* in his lap, *Edward* the 6. a young Child; and Qu. *Elizabeth*, a woman: fit heads to consult of Religion. Yet were they all successively by Acts of Parliament either created or declar'd Supreame heads of the Church of *England*; a Prerogative never challeng'd by any Christian Prince before. The following Kings found the breach made, and the Schism completed. What Clergy, but *Cranmer* that Arch-Sycophant? who according to History by his whispers in the King's ear, was the first authour of the Secession from the Pope; and as the pretended Bishop *Bramhall* confesses, *struck the* [a] *nail home*. What Clergy but intruders? when under *Edward* the 6. *Protestantisme* was establish't in *England* contrary to the liking of most of the true Bishops of that time: And when under Queen [b] *Elizabeth* all the Bishops but one were deposed; and by *Cambden*'s confession, eighty Curates, fifty Prebendaries, fifteen Presidents of Colledges, twelve Arch-Deacons, and six Abbots lost their places

Baker in Hen. 8. pag. 43. in Edward 6. pag. 73. in Eliz. p. 113.

Godwin in vita Cranmeri. Parker ibidem.

a Of Schism, pag. 44.

b In vita Elizab. pag. anno 1559.

ces, when also the inferiour Clergy in a Convocation appointed by that very Queen protested against the Reformation. What? the Laiety too? have they against all Antiquity power to define matters of Religion? When *Theodosius* the younger sent his Ambassadour to the Council of *Ephesus*, which was the third Generall one, he writ to the Council, that he sent him *Ea Lege*, upon that condition, that in questions of Religion he should have nothing to doe: giving this reason: [c] *It is not lawfull for him that is not a Bishop, to meddle in businesses and consultations of the Church.* The same said *Basil* the Emperour to the Laiety in the seventh Generall Council: [d] *'Tis not lawfull for you to treat in Ecclesiasticall Causes.* And long before that, *Justinian*: [e] *If the businesse be Ecclesiasticall, let no Civil Magistrate deale in such questions, &c.* But in fine, what Laiety was it, but a *Cromwell* and such like flatterers? *It was generally conceived, and truly, as I think*, saith *Weaver* in his Monuments, pag. 101. *that those politick ways for taking away the Pope's authority, and suppressing Religious Houses were principally devised by Cromwell.* And Bishop *Gardiner* in *Fox*, pag. 1344. saith, *The Parliament was with much cruelty constrained to abolish and put away the Primacy from the Bishop of Rome.*

Fullers Ch. Hist. Centur. 16. p. 55. 56.

[c] *Epist. ad Synod. Ephes. & 7. Concil. Gene.*

[d] *Justinia. Constit. 123.*

21. Yea but these Reformers *did not consult flesh and bloud*: O no! King *Henry* consulted the spirit, when lusting after *Anne Bolen*, he tore himself from the Pope for refusing him the grant of a Divorce; and to satisfie his avarice, he seized upon

upon all the goods of Monasteries. What spi-
it the Protectour and Parliament under *Edward*
the Sixth consulted, whether God or *Mammon*,
Baker tell you. There you may read how di- *In Edw. 6.*
vers Bishops were committed to prison for misli- *pag. 73.*
king the Reformation, *and all of them dispoßeßed*
of their Bishopricks, and that which is worse, the
Bishopricks themselves were dispossed of their re-
venues. ---A Parliament was held--- wherein
divers Chantries, Colledges, Free Chappels, Frater-
nities and Guilds with all their Lands and goods
were given to the King, which being sold at a low
rate, enriched many, and enobled some, and there-
by made them firm in maintaining the change;
thus *Baker*, Queen *Elisabeth*, bred up a *Catho-*
lick, and by a *Catholick* Bishop consecrated
Queen, consulted Eternity, when to buy a Crown
she sold her Religion. *Or expect the Church of*
Rome should have been their Physician, which was
indeed their great disease. So it was in very deed.
For the rot of heresie spreading amongst them,
how could they but perish, rejecting the cure of
their supreame Pastour? But you *had recourse to*
the Scriptures. The very plea of all Hereticks,
Nolo verba, quæ non sunt scripta, cri'd out *Hilarius lib.*
an *Arian* against the *Nicene* Faith. But *contr. Con-*
you reserved to your selves, what you de- *stant.*
ni'd to the whole Church, the expounding of
Scriptures: and what passes all astonishment, con-
fessing your selves errable in the interpreting of
Scripture, yet in despight of all Gods Church you
hammer'd out a negative Religion, never known

to

to the world before. Yes, to the *Fathers of the Primitive Church*, say you: Find you negative Articles in the Fathers, and the matter is ended. Mind onely by the way, that 'twill not suffice to alledge the not finding our positive Doctrines in the primitive Fathers; for you do not only not believe them, as neither *Turks* nor *Heathens* do; but you positively believe their opposite negatives contained expressely in your 39. Articles of Religion; as Art. 21. No generall Council but may erre, Art. 22. No *Purgatory*, no lawfull invocation of Saints, no respect due to holy Images: 28. No Transubstantiation: 31. No Sacrifices of *Masses*, but blasphemous Fables, &c. These Negatives therefore, being Articles of your Religion, must not be bare *non entities*, (whereof there be many millions) but verities divinely revealed, otherwise unfit to be objects of Christian Faith. Consequently, they must be found either in clear and uncontrovertible Scripture; or in Scripture so interpreted by the primitive Fathers, or in traditionary Doctrines of the same Fathers. This you never being able to do, 'tis in vain to pretend to Fathers of the *Primitive* Church, who never speak of your Negatives revealed, whatever they do of our Positives.

22. Sir, 'tis not the style of your Progenitours to appeal to the Fathers. *Luther* contemns them; *I care not if a* [a] *thousand Austins, a thousand Tertullians stand against me.* [b] *Zwinglius* slights them: *Thou beginn'st to cry Fathers, Fathers; the Fathers have so delivered: but I doe not aske thee Fathers, nor Mothers: I require the Word of God.*

[a] *Cont. Henricum Octavum. tom. 2. f. 344. p. 2.*

[b] *In. explan. art. 4. edit. 1581. Tiguri.*

Jewel

Jewell appeal'd to the first six hundred yeares, but was rebuked for it by Doctor *Humphrey*: *He was over liberall, &c. What have we to doe with Fathers?* *Whitaker* values them not a rush: *Neither think your self to have proved any thing, though you bring against us the whole swarm of Fathers, except that which they say be justified not by the voyce of man, but by God himself.* Which is to say: that though all the ancient Fathers should agree upon a Text of Scripture: yet if Mr. *Whitaker* disagrees, they are all to be rejected. S. *Austin* will tell you, that all *Heresies are hatcht, whil'st good Scriptures are ill understood: and what in them is understood amisse, is rashly and boldly asserted.* What greater rashnesse, then for one man to pretend the true sense of Scriptures against the current of Antiquity? Is it not a stupendious thing, that the Bishop of *Canterbury* should say of King *James* at the Conference of *Hampton-Court*; † *Undoubtedly his Majesty spake by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost:* and that this assistance should be denied to the whole Church of Christ in her greatest, and most sacred Assemblies? But if you ever admit of an appeale to the Fathers, 'twill surely be to such an age, wherein few or none treated the matter in question: and then the first that mentions it in after ages, must be in your judgement a broacher of Novelties, though none of those times ever thought so: for, as what S. *John* writ in his Gospel, beyond other Canonicall Writers, stay'd unwritten above threescore yeares after the Ascension, till some occasion rose

In vita Ievelli p. 212.

Cont. Sander. p. 92.

Neque enim natæ sunt hæreses, nisi dum Scripturæ bonæ intelliguntur non bene & quod in iis non bene intelligitur, temerè & audacter asseritur. *Tract.* 18. *in Ioann.*

† *Baker in vita Iacobi.*

aroſe of leaving it upon record, and yet in that interim it was doubtleſſe known to the Primitive Church: So, why might not other Doctrines of the Apoſtles be kept onely by Tradition, till ſome hint was given to the Fathers of enſuing ages, to publiſh them in writing? How many things paſſe long before they are committed to paper?

23. At length *you ſeparated from our ulcers*; that is, from the three eſſentials, Communion in Faith, Communion in Sacraments, and the Miniſtry or Government of our Church; and yet left the body or ſubſtance undeſtroy'd. But your *Perkins* will tell you, that *'tis a notable policy of the Devil, which he hath put into the heads of ſundry men of this age, that our Religion and the preſent Church of Rome are all one in ſubſtance.* He addes to this, *that we raſe the foundation.* Be it as 'twill, either Salvation might have been had in the Church you left, or no. If it might, as you muſt ſay, that left her intire in ſubſtance: 'twas a damnable Schiſme, to ſeparate from her; ſeeing *Proteſtants* confeſſe, that no cauſe but neceſſity of Salvation can juſtifie ſuch a ſeparation. If it might not, then 'twas no true Church, nor had Chriſt any true Church upon earth, able to ſave men, and conſequently no Church at all: ſince that in ſeparating from the *Roman*, you divided from all Churches in the world, as I ſhall ſhew anon; and you have never yet ſhewed what ulcer in particular it was, for which you could not eſcape eternal death, in the whole Church of Chriſt before *Luther*.

In his Dedicatory of the Reformed Catholick.

Dr. Potter, Sect. 3. p. 73. Chillingw. cap. 8. Dr. Land. Sect. 26.

24. Here you tell us of a *remarkable infirmity obvious*

obvious in our Writers. That *they complain you have left their Church, but never ſhew you that* Iota, *as to which you have left the word of God, or the Apoſtles, or the uncorrupted and Primitive Church, or the four firſt General Councils.* As if it were poſſible to leave the whole Church of God, and not to leave the word of God, ſo ſtrictly commanding to hear the Church. Saint *Auſtin* thought he *p* obey'd the word of God, when he obey'd the Church, commending the word of God; and which otherwiſe he would not have believed to be the word of God. And can you hope to diſobey the Church, and not diſobey the word of God, ſo highly commending the ſame Church? This truth hath been made to ſhine out as clear as the Sun at mid-day, by *Bellarmine*, *Peròn*, *Stapleton*, and others: but obſtinate blindneſſe will not ſee it. You talk of primitive times, the firſt four Councils, pureſt Chriſtians: but good Mr. Doctor, can you demonſtrate out of Scripture, that all conteſts about faith poſſibly ariſing in future ages, were to be decided in thoſe primitive times, or in the four firſt General Councils? and thoſe deciſions by unperiſhable or unalterable records to be all tranſmitted to our dayes? Can you clearly ſhew that by Chriſts command his Church was onely to be heard in her younger age, and ever after unheard and ſlighted? If not, your appeale to thoſe times is but a deſperate ſhift, extorted from you by the force of our Arguments. And yet at that very weapon we defie and vanquiſh you by your own Confeſſions. Hath not Cardinal

p. Cont. Epiſt. fundamenti c. 3. & 4.

Peràn

Perón, in his Reply to King *James*, clearly evinc'd the Pope's Supreamacy to have been acknowledg'd in the first four Councils? Doe not those two Learned Books, the *Protestants* q *Apology*, and the *Progeny* r *of Catholicks and Protestants*, shew undeniably out of your own Authours, that the Roman Church remained pure for the first four hundred and forty yeares after Christ, giving that reason why the Fathers of those ages, *Austin*, *Epiphanius*, *Optatus*, *Tertullian*, and *Irenaus* appealed against Hereticks to the succession of the Roman Bishops, *because*, saith Doctor *Reynolds*, *it was a proof of the true faith at that time*! And this answer of your Doctors is highly commended by Bishop *Morton* in the *Protestants Appeal*, pag. 573. Doe not the same two Books farther shew from your own concessions, and out of the ancient Fathers, that within those 440. yeares, even up to Pope *Sylvester* and *Constantine*'s time, and so to the Apostles, there were *Churches dedicated in the honour of Martyrs*, *Relicks*, *Pilgrimages to Hierusalem*, *forbidding Priests to marry*, *vowed Virginity*, *Invocation of Saints*, *the Primacy of the Roman Bishop*, *the unbloudy Sacrifice*, *Real presence*, *Transubstantiation*, *Confession*, *Prayer for the Dead*, *Free-will*, *Justification by Works*, *Merit*, *Tradition*, *Purgatory*, *Vowes*, *Evangelicall Councils*, *Monachisme*, *and other Mysteries of Faith*? What then do you talk, as if none of our tenets or practises, in which we differ from you, could be trac't by sure footsteps, as far as the times of the purest Christians.

q Tract. 1. Sect. 3.

r Lib. 1. c. 5. & 6.

Conferences with Hart, pag. 442.

25. Do

25. Doe not you beat the aire, whil'ſt you labour to prove thoſe Doctrines to be novelties, which your own confeſſe to have had a being in the very times of your appeal, the times of pureſt Chriſtians? But if diſowning your domeſtick witneſſes, you will needs draw down the birth of ſuch pretended Novelties to the ſixth age, about S. *Gregory* the Great's time, in whoſe dayes Popery, ſay yours, was under full ſail: then we juſtly expect, that you demonſtrate, how ſuch a preſſe of errours either did, or could, within the narrow compaſſe of 160. yeares crowd into the Church without noiſe or oppoſition of Nation, City, Family, or ſingle Perſon. Eſpecially, if we conſider, firſt the reluctancy of mans nature to accept of any Doctrines ſo contrary to fleſh and blood, as Confeſſion, Faſting, Celibate in the Clergy, Belief of the Real Preſence, &c. Secondly, the perpetual vigilancy of the Paſtours Chriſt left in his Church to watch upon the walls of *Jeruſalem* day and night; which duty the Paſtours of thoſe dayes complyed with ſo exactly, that from the year 327. till the year 680. they held againſt hereſies newly riſing, ſix Generall Councils, whereof one was call'd onely nine years before the ſaid interval, as the Council of *Epheſus*: two, during the very ſpace of the 160. yeares, to wit, that of *Chalcedon*, and the ſecond of *Conſtantinople*, the laſt, fourſcore yeares after. How is it imaginable, that none of theſe Councils meeting ſo frequently to ſuppreſſe errours, ſhould take notice of ſo many new Doctrines you object, if in truth they had been Novelties. Thirdly, that thoſe

See the Centuriſts, Centur. 6. verbo Gregorius in Indice.

Hoſpin. Hiſtoria Sacram. lib. 2. pag. 157. Dr. Humphrey Ieſuit. part. 2. ret. 5. where he ſayes that Gregory and Auſtin brought into England the whole Chaos of Popiſh ſuperſtition.

Doctrines ſtole not into the *Roman* Church alone, but ſpread through all the Chriſtian Churches then extant in the world, both Eaſt and Weſt, with all which S. *Gregory* held communion, as may be ſeen in his Epiſtles. Can the wit of man conceive ſuch wilfull, obſtinate, dead ſilence in all Churches, at the ſtarting up of ſo many falſe Doctrines in ſo ſhort a ſpace, eſpecially all the Fathers holding Novelties in Doctrine for Errours?

26. But here comes in *a childiſh fallacy* even *of our greateſt Giants in diſpute*: that *they ſhut up the Church in Rome, as the Donatiſts in Africa, and then call it the Catholick Church, not formally, but cauſally, ſaith Cardinal Perón.* If Cardinal *Perón* were but a Child, 'twere no great ſhame to ſlip into a fallacy: but for a Preacher of the Court to deceive his Royall Auditory, cannot be excuſed from an Impoſture. Doth Cardinal *Perón* ſhut up the Church in the City of *Rome* even cauſally? Doth he not diſtinguiſh two acceptions of the *Roman* Church? The firſt ſignifies all the Orthodox Churches of the world, united in faith and charity with the *Roman* Biſhop, as with their Head, and Supreame Governour under Chriſt. And in this ſenſe, according to Antiquity, the Catholick Church, not cauſally, but formally, is ſtiled the *Roman* Church: as all Nations under the *Roman* Emperour, and not the City and Territories of *Rome* alone, were called the *Roman* Empire: All the twelve Tribes of Iſrael, the Jewiſh Church: and all Nations under the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, the *Greek* Church, as the *Muſ-*

covites

vites and *Russians*, though not *Grecians* by birth. In this notion S. *Austin* himself saith, that *against the Pelagians, not onely the Councils of Bishops, and the See Apostolick, but also, Universam Romanam Ecclesiam, the whole Roman Church, and the whole Roman Empire were most justly incens'd.* Now because the Bishop of the Roman Diocess, as Pope, that is, as *S. Peter's* Successor, and Vicar of Christ, is the head of all Bishops, & by him all Churches are preserved in unity; therefore that particular Church of the Roman Diocess, is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches: whence in a second acception, the Roman Church is not improperly called the Catholick Church, not formally, but causally, in regard of that unity she infuseth into the Catholick Church, knitting all the Members thereof in one Body, under one supreme Head. What ere you think, this was the sence of the ancient Fathers. *Tertullian* [b] speaking of *Marcion*, who had offered money to the Roman Church, saith, *Marcion gave his money to the Catholick Church, which was rejected, both it, and himself, when he fell into Heresy.* *S. Cyprian* [c] speaks thus to *Antonianus*: *You writ that I should send a copie of the Letters to Cornelius,* (Pope) *to the end that he might understand, that you communicate with him, that is to say, with the Catholick Church.* *S. Cyprian* [d] also writes to *Cornelius. It seemed good to us that Letters should be sent to our Colleagues at Rome, that they should firmly embrace your communion, that is to say, the Catholick Church.* And S. *Ambrose-*

[a] *Lib. de peccato Originali, c. 17.*

[b] *Contra Marcion. lib. 4. c. 4.*

[c] *Lib. 4. Epist. 2.*

[d] *Ibidem Epist. 45. ad Cornelium.*

in his Funerall Oration upon the death of his Brother *Satyrus*, writes, that *Satyrus* coming to *Sardinia*, then infected with the Hereſie of the *Luciferians*, called for the Biſhop, & enquired of him, *Utrum nam cum Epiſcopis Catholicis, hoc eſt, cum Romana Eccleſia conveniret.* *Whether he were in communion with the Catholick Biſhops, that is, with the Church of* Rome. And *Iohn*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, writes in theſe words to Pope *Hormiſda* 1000. yeares paſt: *We promiſe e hereafter not to recite in the ſacred myſteries, the names of thoſe that have ſeparated themſelves from the Catholick Church, that is to ſay, who agree not fully with the See Apoſtolick.* Note that in all theſe places I have cited, the words, *that is*, or *that is to ſay*, are not mine, but the Authours cited.

e Tomo 3. Concil. edit. Binii inter epiſt. Hormiſdæ.

27. This then was the ſtyle of the ancient Fathers, which you not ſeeing, or not caring whom you ſtrike at, call a childiſh fallacy in one of the Learnedſt Cardinalls the Church ever had. Nay the very *Arians* themſelves, knowing to their grief, *Roman* and *Catholick* to be in the common phraſe, *Synonima*: yet to diſgrace Catholicks, called them Romaniſts, as you doe now. f *Victor* Biſhop of *Utica* recounts, that *Jocundus* an *Arian*, ſaid to King *Theodoric*, *If thou put Armogaſtus to death, the* Romaniſts *will proclaim him a Martyr.* g And *Gregory* of *Tours*, records, that *Theodegeſilus* an *Arian* or Pagan King, ſeeing a Miracle done at the Font of a Catholick Church, ſaid to himſelf, *Quia eſt ingenium Romanorum*, this is a device of the

f Lib. 2. de perſec. Vandal.

g De gloria Martyr. l. 1. c. 25.

he *Romans*. *Hoc enim nomine vocitant noſtræ Religionis homines*. For ſo they call men of our Religion. 'Tis you, not we, that ſtand in parallel with the *Donatiſts*. The Roman Church is ſpread over the four parts of the world, every where the ſame, perfectly agreeing in Faith, Sacraments, and Diſcipline: Your pretended Church is confined to a ſmall part of *Europe*, (as the *Donatiſts* to *Africa*) divided into many Sects, condemning one another *b* as incapable of Salvation: You ſought Communion with the *Greek* Church, but *i* were juſtly repuls'd, and ſo would yet be, whereſoever you try'd, there being no Church in the world, except the Reformed, that will joyn with you in external communion of Sacraments, Liturgies, and Church duties. To make your Church ſwell, you are forc'd now adayes to take in moſt Hereticks in the world; *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Sacramentarians*, *&c.* not remembring that famous ſaying, gathered out of *S. Auſtin*, cited by the moſt Learned Biſhop of *Chalcedon* in his Treatiſe of Schiſme. *k Catholicks are every where, and Hereticks are every where: But Catholicks are the ſame every where, and Hereticks are different every where*. Conſequently for want of union cannot poſſibly make up one Church. And if they had all the ſame errours in Faith, they would ſtill be Hereticks, and no Church of Chriſt.

b See the 4. Catalogues in the end of the Proteſtant Apology, & Coccius, Tom. 1. l. 8. art. 4. 7. 8. &c.

i See Jeremias Patriarch of Conſtantinople his Anſwer to the Lutherans.

k Lib. 4. contra Creſconium. c. 61. See S. Auſtin. lib. de Paſtor. cap. 8. to the ſame purpoſe.

28. Behold a reaſon in brief. Though the word Church taken grammatically ſignifie any congregation of men, yet in the ſence of the holy Scripures, Fathers, and ancient cuſtome, 'tis reſtrained

to the ſole company of Chriſtians united in Divine Faith, Sacraments, and obedience to their Paſtour. Divine Faith therefore being of the eſſential form that makes one a member of the Church, how can Hereticks, who according to S. *Paul*, *have made ſhipwrack touching Faith*, be parts of the true Church? upon which ſcore the Apoſtle commands *Titus*, c. 3. *to avoid an Heretick, becauſe he is ſubverted and condemned of himſelf.* S. *Cyprian* denyed *Novatianus* to be in the Church, *Quando ipſe in Eccleſia non ſit.* *Optatus Melevitanus* againſt *Parmenian* ſaith, that *Præter unam Eccleſiam: Beſides one Church which is the true Catholick Church, the reſt among Hereticks are thought to be, but are not.* S. *Hierome* againſt the *Luciferians*, *Nulla congregatio Hæretica poteſt dici Eccleſia Chriſti: No Hereticall congregation can be called a Church of Chriſt*, But none ſo expreſs for this matter as S. *Auſtin*, who in his 48. Epiſtle ſpeaking to the *Donatiſts*: *Nobiſcum eſtis: You are*, ſaith he, *with us in Baptiſme, in the Creed, in the reſt of our Lords Sacraments: In ipſa Eccleſia Catholica non eſtis: In the Catholick Church you are not.* Mark that they believed all the Articles of the Creed, and conſequently your fundamentalls. Now all the Congregations in the world, diſagreeing from the Roman in points of Faith, are manifeſtly Hereticks, and went out of her by known errours. Therefore no Churches, nor parts of the true Church.

l Epiſt. 76. ad Magnum.

See S. Auſtin de fide & Symb. cap. 10. in Pſalm. 149. tom. Epiſt. fundam. tract. 100. in Ioan. de Cat. rudib. c. 7. & 27.

29. The *Egyptians*, *Ethiopians*, and *Abyſſins* not of our Communion, are *Eutychians*, holding but

but one Nature, Will and Operation in Christ, and were condemned by the fourth General Council of *Chalcedon*, with them side part of the *Armenians*, the *Jacobits*, *Georgians*, & *Cophtes*. The *Tartarian Christians* under the *Turk* and *Persian* in *Asia*, follow *Nestorius*, condemned by the third General Council of *Ephesus* for holding two Persons in Christ. Yet *Baxter* [m] blushes not to screw both *Nestorians* and *Eutychians* into the *Protestant* Church, under pretence that they differ not in sense, but only in words from the *Catholick* Church; As if the silly Minister understood their meaning better then all the Learned Fathers of the two Generall Councils of *Ephesus* & *Chalcedon*, that condemn'd and cast them out of the Church for Hereticks. What will *Baxter* answer to that Act of Parliament under Queen *Elisabeth*, impowering Bishops *to judge any matter or cause to be heretick, which by the first four General Councils, or any one of them, have bin determin'd to be heresies*. If the opinions of *Nestorius* and *Eutyches* were not Heresies, as well in sense as in words, what did those two General Councils determine to be heresies? The *Abyssines* reject the Council of *Chalcedon* to this day, and admit Circumcision, with other Ceremonies of the *Jewes*. The *Grecians* with their adherents, *Muscovites* and *Russians*, even in S. *Athanasius* his Creed are excluded from Salvation for denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. Of whom your *Thomas Rogers* upon the 39. Articles pronounced thus; *This discovereth all them to be impious, and erre*

[m] *Safe Religion, p.* 112.

Statut. 1. *Elisab.*

Rosse's View of Religions, p. 495.

from the way of truth, which hold and affirm that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, but not from the Son, as this day the Grecians, the Russians, the Muscovites maintain. Note that *Rogers* Book was perused, and by the authority of the Church of *England* allowed to be publick.

30. Of *Luther* and *Calvin*'s pretended Churches there is no doubt, as holding many aged errours, long since condemned by Councils and Fathers for Heresies. See the Catalogues of old Heresies collected by *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, *Isidore*, and St. *Austin*, who for example having rank'd *Aerius* amongst Hereticks for denying Sacrifice and Prayer for the dead, ends his Book, assuring, that whosoever holds any of those Heresies cannot be a Catholick: Much lesse then such as hold with the *Pelagians*, that Children dying unbaptized may be saved; with the *Novatians*, no power in Priests to remit sins; with the *Manichees*, no externall Sacrifice, or Free-will; with certain Hereticks in S. *Ignatius* the Martyr's dayes, no Reall presence; with *Vigilantius*, no single life of Priests: with *Jovinian*, no difference of merits, *a &c.*

a See the Progeny of Catholicks and Protestants lib. 3 c. 2, 3, 4, 5.

31. Whence I conclude, that since all other Churches in the world disagreeing from the *Roman*, are by sacred Antiquity held and confessed Hereticall, and by consequence no Churches: The *Roman* alone, with all the Churches of her Communion, is the true Church of Christ; there being no other upon earth free from errours in Faith, and the *Roman* never yet proved erroneous. See 17. other

other parallells of *Protestants* with the *Donatists* in *Gualterus* his *Chronicon*, Seculo 4.

32. Here also you have a fling at Cardinall *Peròn* for his want of memory, as if he forgot, that the Preaching of Christ began at *Jerusalem*. 'Tis a notorious vanity in your Pulpit-men, to be alwayes pecking at our great ones. Who denies, that in priority of time other Churches might prevent the *Roman*, and in that sense precisely, be either Mothers or Sisters to her, as you please? The Motherhood of the *Roman* Church consists in her priority, not of Time, but of Dignity and Jurisdiction, grounded upon S. *Peter*'s Primacy: who as he was Father and Head of all Bishops; so the *Roman* Church, in which by his Successours he still *liveth and governeth*, saith S. *Chrysologus* o, *is the Mother and Head of all Churches*: or with S. p *Cyprian*, *The root and original of the Catholick Church*. The Church of *Cæsarea* began after that of *Jerusalem*, and yet was made her Metropolitan, as the first Council of *Nice* q declared; and *Antioch* was her Primate. Even so *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, and all other Churches, founded before the *Roman*, were afterwards made subject unto her. For which reason *Juvenal* the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, said publickly in the Council of *Ephesus* r: that *the ancient Custome, and Apostolical Tradition was, that the Church of Antioch is to be ruled and judged by the Roman.*

o *Epist. ad Eutychium.*

p *De simplicitate Prælatorum.*

q *Canon 7.*

r *Act. 4. c. 4. apud. Pin. tom. 1. 794.*

33. You falsifie *Gildas* egregiously, and by misplacing his words, make him say what he never dreamt of; namely, that Christian Religion was planted

planted in *Britany* in the dayes of *Tiberius Cæsar*, about seven yeares before S. *Peter* came to *Rome*. But *Gildas* having spoken of the extreame desolation of his Countrey, caused by the Warres with the *Romans* (which Warres beginning, not under *Tiberius*, or *Caius*, who never Warred with the *Britains*, but under *Claudius*, lasted 40. yeares) *Interea*, saith he, *In the mean time*, (to wit, during those Warres) *there appeared and imparted it self to this cold Island, more remote from the visible Sun then other Nations, the true and invisible Sun (which in the time of Tiberius Cæsar, had manifested himself to the whole world) I mean, Christ vouchsafed to impart his Precepts, &c.* Here *Gildas* onely sayes, that during the Warres with *Claudius*, the Sun of justice, that manifested himself to the world by his Preaching in *Jerusalem* under *Tiberius*, appeared at length to the *Britains*, that is, in the dayes of *Claudius*, in whose second year, St. *Peter* comming to *Rome*, was entertained by a noble *British* Lady, named *Claudia Ruffina*: But when all the Jewes were banisht from *Rome*, he took that occasion to go Preaching into *France*, and from thence into *Britany*, where he planted the Gospel, founded Churches, and ordained Priests and Deacons, as *Metaphrastes* recounts, and S. *Peter* himself, in the time of S. *Edward* the Confessor, revealed to a holy man: so hath *Alredus* † *Rhievallis* left upon Record 500. yeares since. Whence it appeares, that not S. † *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, in the time of *Tiberius*, but S. *Peter*, in the time of *Claudius*, founded

† *In vita S. Edwardi* † *'Tis not known precisely when S. Joseph of Arimathea entred into Britany; who came not so much to preach, as to lead a solitary life.*

founded the *Britiſh* Church, after he had founded the Church of *Rome*, and fixt his Seat there.

34. But let us ſuppoſe Chriſtianity to have been in *Britany* before St. *Peter* came to *Rome*, was it then planted in the Soil, upon the hills and dales of the Land? or in the hearts of the *Britains*? if in the hearts: then I ask, were thoſe *Britains* Engliſh men, or did the *Saxons* receive their Chriſtianity from them? Had not *England*, as *England*, the firſt newes of Chriſt from *Rome*, by Saint *Auſtin* the Monk, whom bleſſed St. *Gregory* directed to our Converſion? And are not all *Engliſh* Proteſtants now living, who call themſelves a Chriſtian Church, the offſpring of thoſe firſt converted *Saxons*? what hideous ingratitude is it then, to ſmother the memory of ſo incomparable a benefit by ſtill prating of old *Britany*? whoſe faith whenceſoever it ſprung up firſt, laſted not, but Paganiſme overgrowing it, periſht in a ſhort ſpace, root and branch, till Pope *Eleutherius* replanted it durably: yet ſo, as it never ſpread thence to us *Engliſh*: ſo great was the *Britains* hatred to the *Saxons* for uſurping their Kingdome. I conclude therefore with the two Royal Teſtimonies of our Kings: the firſt of [u] *Henry* the 8. profeſſing, that *all the Churches of the Faithfull* (much more *England*) *acknowledge and reverence the moſt holy See of* Rome *for their Mother*. The ſecond of King *James* of glorious memory, in the ſumme of the conference before

[u] *Lib. cont. Lutherum. art. 2.*

Pag. 75.

His

Majesty, affirming, *that the Roman Church was once the Mother Church*; let Sir * Edward Cook be the Appendix; *We do not deny* saith he, *but that Rome was the Mother Church and had thirty two Virginall Martyrs of her Popes a row.*

* *Epist. Dedicator. of F. Parsons to him, p. 3.*

35. Thus having gone over the undemonstrable principles of your Sermon, asserting much, and proving nothing; I come now to your pretended Demonstrations. But first I must mind you, that in case you should demonstrate, as you promise *the Novelty of our pretensions, & evince the antiquity of your own*: yet to the main truth or falsity of Religion, by your own confession, 'twere but a *Topick*, reaching no farther then a meer probability, which may in it self, be as well false as true. For in your third page you cite and approve the principle of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *who*, say you, *to prove the truth of any Doctrine, argues the case from a threefold Topick*; *the universality, the consent*, *and the antiquity of Tradition*: wherefore in your opinion, not only universality of place wherein a Doctrine is believed, or the consent of Fathers that believe and teach the same; but also Antiquity of time (though from the beginning) when it is believed, is but a bare *Topick*. And yet, God knowes, this very Rule is your open condemnation. Since it is impossible for you, or all the Protestants in the world, to shew that any one point of Doctrine, wherein you differ from the *Roman Church*, was ever believed, not onely in all places, at all times, or by all the Fathers;

but

but not so much as any one place, at any one time, or by any one Father, nay or by any one person before *Luther*; except perhaps by some such as were noted and condemned for *Hereticks*.

Doctor

Doctor *Pierce's* Engagement to demonstrate the Novelties of the *Roman* Church.

Pag. 6. and 7.

We cannot better put them to shame, then by demonstrating the Novelties of their pretensions, whil'st at the same time we evince the sacred antiquity of our own. Thus you.

36. Who can but wonder, that a Doctor understanding what a Demonstration is, should esteem the flourishes of a Pulpit, demonstrations, and then blunder out nothing but old Arguments, which have been answered a hundred times over? If you say the sence of Scripture on your side is evident; Our men ten to one more in number, equall in Learning (not to say more) and as upright in conscience, doe averre the contrary. And the contest it self destroyes your assertion. For whence, I pray, arises this very controversie amongst men of equall abilities to judge aright, but from the obscurity of Scripture? Did ever men in their right wits, having their eyes open, dispute whether the Sun shin'd at mid-day? To Demonstrations from universall Tradition you pretend not: as well because such discourses in your opinion are but Topicks, as because you are able to bring nothing against our positive Doctrines, but empty Negatives, the silence of the

the Fathers in two or three ages, who writ little or nothing of our preſent debates. And I hope you will not ſo much as pretend, that a few inconſiderable ſpeeches of ſome Catholick Writers make up Demonſtrations againſt that Church, in which they lived and died. But 'tis now high time to ponder your Demonſtrations.

Againſt the Pope's Supreamacy.

The firſt Demonſtration.

Page 16.

37. Phocas *the Emperour in the year* 606. ſaith *Baronius*, as you quote him, *being angry with* Cyriacus *Biſhop of Conſtantinople, adjudged the Title of* Univerſall *to the Roman Biſhop alone*; to whom it had been given in a Nationall Counſil of *a Conſtantinople* under *Mēnas*, ſeventy yeares before; and in the *b* Council of *Chalcedon*, one of the four firſt Generall Synods, more then two hundred yeares paſt. a *Act.* 11. b *Act.* 3.

Therefore not onely the Title, which was the preciſe queſtion, but alſo the primacy of juriſdiction, and univerſall Paſtorſhip, whereof there was no queſtion at all, began under *Phocas*, and ſo was a Novelty, according to our Saviours words: *'Twas not ſo from the beginning*. A very robuſtious Demonſtration.

39. This

39. This is confirmed, because *Phocas* was *the greatest Villain in the world besides* Cromwell *and* Pontius Pilate.

Therefore the Pope's Supreamacy must of necessity have begun under *Phocas*, let never so many precedent exercises of that power, holy Fathers, and Councils shew the contrary.

40. 'Tis farther confirm'd by the abuse offered to *Baronius*, whose words are partly alter'd, partly conceal'd. His words rightly quoted are these: *Phocas therefore incenst against Cyriacus, enacted by an Imperial Edict, that such a Title* (of universall Bishop) *did become the Roman Church alone, and that it agreed onely to the Roman Bishop to be styled Universall, and not to the Bishop of Constantinople.* And why, but because the Bishop of *Rome*, as S. *Peter's* Successour, was known to be the supream Pastour of all Churches.

41. The words quite concealed, clearly shewing *Baronius* his judgement, are these: *What then did Phocas by his Edict conferre upon the Roman Church? Nothing, but that by his sentence he declared the Title of* Universall *to be unduly usurped by the Bishop of Constantinople, which was due to the Roman Church alone; since that even her adversaries* (the Bishops of *Constantinople*) *contradicted not, that the Roman Church had always held the Primacy over all Churches, as above in due place hath been most largely demonstrated.* Had all these words been fairly cited, your proof out of *Baronius*, that the Pope's Supreamacy began under *Phocas*, would have appeared in its proper colours,

it

it being evident, that *Phocas* did not first conferre even the Title in question, much lesse the Jurisdiction: but onely declare that of right it belonged to the Popes of *Rome*: who notwithstanding never used it, as the Bishops of *Constantinople* presumed to doe.

The second Demonstration.

Page 17.

42. *Looking back to the beginning, we find that the Wall of Gods City had twelve Foundations, and in them were the Names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.* Revel. 21. 24.

But all foundations of the same wall, in which mens Names are written, be equall in every respect.

Therefore the twelve Apostles, signified by those twelve foundations, were all equall in every respect.

Nay more, the ancient Prophets upon this account were all equall every way, as well amongst themselves, (though some were Kings and Governours of the rest) as with the Apostles; *because we are built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles*, Ephes. 2.20. And why not the Apostles equal to Christ, who is also a foundation of the wall of Gods City? *Other foundation can no man lay, then that that is laid, which is Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 3.

Therefore S. *Peter* was only equall to the other Apostles, and could in no respect have a primacy

over them, though you your ſelf grant him a primacy of order before them all, and by conſequence a ſtep above equality. A gallant conviction.

To back this Demonſtration, let us adde another taken out of the ſame Chapter of the *Revel.* verſ. 5. 12. where it is likewiſe ſaid, that *the City of God had twelve Gates, and at the Gates twelve Angels, and Names written thereon, which are the Names of the twelve Tribes of the Children of Iſrael.* Now if one ſhould argue thus, to prove that the Tribe of *Juda* had not the Scepter, or primacy of Civil power over the reſt, but was equall in all regards.

The City of God had twelve Gates with twelve Angels, and on them the Names of the twelve Tribes of Iſrael.

But all Gates and Angels, who have mens names written upon them, are equall in every reſpect.

Therefore the twelve Tribes of *Iſrael* ſignified by thoſe twelve Gates and Angels, were equall in every reſpect. [a]

Would not he argue like a ſtout Logician?

a See a farther anſwer in the acute Authour of Schiſme diſarm'd. Sect. 13.

The third Demonſtration.

Page 17.

43. Whoſoever withſtands another to his face, becauſe through inadvertency, or frailty he do's amiſſe, and ſo ſpeaks to him in the preſence of others, out of pure charity and zeale of the common good, is at leaſt his equall, if not ſuperiour.

But

But S. *Paul* did ſo to S. *Peter*, Galat. 2. 11, 12, 13, 14.

Therefore he was at leaſt his equall, if not his ſuperiour.

44. Blind S. *Cyprian*, that ſaw not this light of evidence, when he ſaid, *Neither Peter, whom our Lord choſe the firſt, and upon whom he built his Church: when Paul diſputed with him about Circumciſion, challenged inſolently, or took arrogantly any thing to himſelf; ſaying that he had the Primacy, and therefore the later Diſciples ought rather to obey him.* Blind S. *Chryſoſtome*, admiring S. *Peter's* virtue: *Paul reproves, and Peter heares; to the end, that whilſt the Maſter reproved holds his peace, the Schollars may learn to change their opinion.* Blind S. *Auſtin*; *That which was done of S. Paul profitably by the liberty of charity, Peter took in good part by holy and benigne godlineſſe of humility, and thereby gave a more rare example to poſterity, if at any time they doe amiſſe, to be contented to be corrected by their Juniors; then Paul gave, to be confidently bold, even Inferiours to reſiſt their betters for defending the truth of the Goſpel: brotherly charity alwayes preſerved.* Blind S. *Gregory*, when he ſaid: *Peter was ſilent, that he who was on the top of the Apoſtleſhip, might be the firſt in humility.*

Epiſt. 71. S. Auguſtin. lib. 2. cont. Donatiſtas, cites theſe words of S. *Cyprian* to the ſame purpoſe.

In cap. 2. ad Galat.

Epiſt. 19.

Hom. 18. in Ezechiel.

45. Sir, good Divinity teacheth us, that there are two kinds of Correction; the one of juſtice, that belongs to Superiours in regard of their Subjects: the other of charity, which concerns all men. For as we are obliged to love our Neighbours:

S. Thomas 2. 2. q. 3. art. 4.

bours: so charity bindes us in due circumstances to use fraternall correction to all; even Superiours: As *Jethro* did to *Moses*, *Joab* to *David*, and S. *Bernard* to Pope *Eugenius*. In a word, S. *Peter's* authority over S. *Paul* was so acknowledged by all Antiquity, that as S. *Hierome* noted, the Villain *Porphyrius* censur'd S. *Paul* of sawcinesse and pride, for checking S. *Peter* his Superiour.

Apud S. Aug. Ep. 11.

The fourth Demonstration.

Pag. 17.

46. The next Demonstration is taken also out of the Epistle to the *Galatians* 2. 9. where S. *Paul* gives an account, how by Divine revelation he went up to *Jerusalem* to communicate his Gospell with the chief Apostles, *Peter*, *James*, and *John*; because some were apt to mistrust his Doctrine, as not having lived with Christ, nor conferr'd with the Apostles, Schollars of Christ. And that the said Apostles, *when they saw the grace that was given to Paul, gave him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship*; that is, received them into their fociety of Preaching, upon agreement, *that we*, saith S. *Paul*, *should goe unto the Gentiles, and they unto the Circumcision*. Hence is hewed out the following Demonstration.

47. Whosoever receiveth into the fellowship of Preaching, one sent unto him by God's appointment, to conferre his Doctrine, that he may not Preach in vain; is either inferiour to the partie

ty sent, and received, or at most his equal.

But S. *Peter* did so receive S. *Paul*.

Therefore *S. Peter* was either inferiour to Saint *Paul*, or at most his equal.

And reason good, for S. Peter was one amongst the three prime Apostles sent to the *Iews*, as Christ himself was, and *S. Paul* to the *Gentiles*, who though in regard of their number, they were *to the Iewes but as the Ocean to a River*, yet in many other respects, being the chosen people of God, had as *S. Paul* said to the *Romans*, *Rom.* 3. 3. *much advantage every way* above the *Gentiles*, and chiefly because unto them *were committed the Oracles of God*: and therefore *S, Paul* himself *Act.* 13. 46. profes's'd to the *Iewes*, *It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing you put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life, Lo! we turn to the Gentiles.* Otherwise *S. Paul* by calling Christ *Minister Circumcisionis*, and himself *Doctour of the Gentiles*, should according to you Mr. *Pierce*, signifie some advantage of honour above Christ in the extent of his Diocesse.

48. To reinforce this demonstration you may adde, that since fellowship argues equality, not onely all Fellowes of a Colledge are equall to their head, that governs them, who is likewise a Fellow; but which is more, we are all equal to Christ our Lord: *being called by God unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 9. much more then was *S. Paul* equall with *S. Peter*; was he not think ye? especially if we add to this, that

S. *Paul* fourteen yeares before went up to *Jerusalem* to see and pay his respects to S. *Peter*; because, faith S. *Ambrose*, 'twas *fit that Paul should desire to see Peter, to whom our Saviour had committed the charge of the Churches.* And Theodoret upon the first to the *Galathians*, *He went to yield to S. Peter, as to the Prince of the Apostles, that honour which was fitting.* And S. *Chrysostome*, *He went to see him above others, because he was the mouth and Prince of the Apostles, and the Head of the whole Company.* And elsewhere, *He went to him as to one greater then himself, and that not in a vulgar manner, but to behold and admire him, as a Personage of great excellency and Majesty, as men go to behold great and famous Cities.*

In 1. ad Galat.

Homil. 87. in Ioan.

In cap. 1. ad Galat.

The fifth Demonstration.

Pag. 17.

49. No man can have spirituall jurisdiction, and a fatherly power over the Church, but he must of necessity Lord it over Gods heritage, and fleece the flock of Christ.

But S. Peter was never known to Lord it over Gods heritage, or fleece the flock of Christ.

Therefore he had no spiritual jurisdiction or fatherly power over the Church; for he rather forbids to *domineer in the Clergy.*

1. Pet. 5. 3.

The *Minor* is granted on both sides; the *Major* is cleere of it self without proofe: for if spiritual

nal jurisdiction could stand without Lording and fleecing, S. *Peter* might be Head of the Church, though he did not Lord it over Gods heritage, or fleece the flock. 'Tis also confirmed by instances. Christ our Saviour had no jurisdiction, forsooth, over the Apostles, because he came not to Lord it, but to serve: *Non veni ministrari, sed ministrare.* Mat. 20. 18. Mark 10. 45. The Apostles had no jurisdiction over their respective Churches for the same reason. Nay, there is no Hierarchie in the Church, as the *Presbyterians* contend against your Episcopal Protestants: because Primates may not Lord it over Arch-Bishops, nor these over Bishops, nor Bishops over Curats, nor Parish Priests over the People: for *whosoever will be great among you, shall be your Minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the Servant of all.* And if you confesse, that for the good government of a Nationall Church, a Hierarchy is necessary, then take the judgement of Mr. *Cartwright* in Mr. *Whitgift's* defence: *If it be necessary for the keeping of unity in the Church, that one Arch-Bishop should be Primat over all, why not as meet, that for the keeping of the whole Universall Church, there should be one Arch-Bishop over all?* Hearken to your Doctor *Covell*, saying to the *Puritans*: *How can they think that equality would keep all the Pastours in the world in peace and unity, &c. For in all Societies, authority, which cannot be where all are equall, must procure unity and obedience.* Observe *Melanchthon's* judgement: *As there are some Bishops that govern divers Churches: the Bishop*

Pag. 380.

In his Examin. against the Plea of the Innocent.

Centur. Epistolar. Theologicar. Ep. 74.

S. *Paul* fourteen yeares before went up to *Jerusalem* to see and pay his respects to S. *Peter*; because, saith S. *Ambrose*, *'twas fit that Paul should desire to see Peter, to whom our Saviour had committed the charge of the Churches.* And *Theodoret* upon the first to the *Galathians*, *He went to yield to S. Peter, as to the Prince of the Apostles, that honour which was fitting.* And S. *Chrysostome*, *He went to see him above others, because he was the mouth and Prince of the Apostles, and the Head of the whole Company.* And elsewhere, *He went to him as to one greater then himself, and that not in a vulgar manner, but to behold and admire him, as a Personage of great excellency and Majesty, as men go to behold great and famous Cities.*

In 1. ad Galat.

Homil. 87. in Ioan.

In cap. 1. ad Galat.

The fifth Demonstration.

Pag. 17.

49. No man can have spirituall jurisdiction, and a fatherly power over the Church, but he must of necessity Lord it over Gods heritage, and fleece the flock of Christ.

But S. Peter was never known to Lord it over Gods heritage, or fleece the flock of Christ.

Therefore he had no spiritual jurisdiction or fatherly power over the Church; for he rather forbids to *domineer in the Clergy.*

1. Pet. 5. 3.

The *Minor* is granted on both sides; the *Major* is cleere of it self without proofe: for if spiritual

tual jurisdiction could stand without Lording and fleecing, S. *Peter* might be Head of the Church, though he did not Lord it over Gods heritage, or fleece the flock. 'Tis also confirmed by instances. Christ our Saviour had no jurisdiction, forsooth, over the Apostles, because he came not to Lord it, but to serve: *Non veni ministrari, sed ministrare.* Mat. 20. 18. Mark 10. 45. The Apostles had no jurisdiction over their respective Churches for the same reason. Nay, there is no Hierarchie in the Church, as the *Presbyterians* contend against your Episcopal Protestants: because Primates may not Lord it over Arch-Bishops, nor these over Bishops, nor Bishops over Curats, nor Parish Priests over the People: for *whosoever will be great among you, shall be your Minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the Servant of all.* And if you confesse, that for the good government of a Nationall Church, a Hierarchy is necessary, then take the judgement of Mr. *Cartwright* in Mr. *Whitgift's* defence: *If it be necessary for the keeping of unity in the Church, that one Arch-Bishop should be Primat over all, why not as meet, that for the keeping of the whole Universall Church, there should be one Arch-Bishop over all?* Pag. 380. Hearken to your Doctor *Covell*, saying to the *Puritans*: *How can they think that equality would keep all the Pastours in the world in peace and unity, &c. For in all Societies, authority, which cannot be where all are equall, must procure unity and obedience.* In his Examin. against the Plea of the Innocent. Observe *Melanthon's* judgement: *As there are some Bishops that govern divers Churches: the Bishop* Centur. Epistolar. Theologicar. Ep. 74.

S. *Paul* fourteen yeares before went up to *Jerusalem* to see and pay his respects to S. *Peter*; because, saith S. *Ambrose*, 'twas *fit that Paul should desire to see Peter, to whom our Saviour had committed the charge of the Churches.* And *Theodoret* upon the first to the *Galathians*, *He went to yield to S. Peter, as to the Prince of the Apostles, that honour which was fitting.* And S. *Chrysostome*, *He went to see him above others, because he was the mouth and Prince of the Apostles, and the Head of the whole Company.* And elsewhere, *He went to him as to one greater then himself, and that not in a vulgar manner, but to behold and admire him, as a Personage of great excellency and Majesty, as men go to behold great and famous Cities.*

In 1. ad Galat.

Homil. 87. in Ioan.

In cap. 1. ad Galat.

The fifth Demonstration.

Pag. 17.

49. No man can have spirituall jurisdiction, and a fatherly power over the Church, but he must of necessity Lord it over Gods heritage, and fleece the flock of Christ.

But S. Peter was never known to Lord it over Gods heritage, or fleece the flock of Christ.

Therefore he had no spiritual jurisdiction or fatherly power over the Church; for he rather forbids to *domineer in the Clergy.*

1. Pet. 5. 3.

The *Minor* is granted on both sides; the *Major* is cleere of it self without proofe; for if spiritual

tual jurisdiction could stand without Lording and fleecing, S. *Peter* might be Head of the Church, though he did not Lord it over Gods heritage, or fleece the flock. 'Tis also confirmed by instances. Christ our Saviour had no jurisdiction, forsooth, over the Apostles, because he came not to Lord it, but to serve: *Non veni ministrari, sed ministrare.* Mat. 20. 18. Mark 10. 45. The Apostles had no jurisdiction over their respective Churches for the same reason. Nay, there is no Hierarchie in the Church, as the *Presbyterians* contend against your Episcopal Protestants: because Primates may not Lord it over Arch-Bishops, nor these over Bishops, nor Bishops over Curats, nor Parish Priests over the People: for *whosoever will be great among you, shall be your Minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the Servant of all.* And if you confesse, that for the good government of a Nationall Church, a Hierarchy is necessary, then take the judgement of Mr. *Cartwright* in Mr. *Whitgift's* defence: *If it be necessary for the keeping of unity in the Church, that one Arch-Bishop should be Primat over all, why not as meet, that for the keeping of the whole Universall Church, there should be one Arch-Bishop over all?* Pag. 380. Hearken to your Doctor *Covell*, saying to the *Puritans*: *How can they think that equality would keep all the Pastours in the world in peace and unity, &c. For in all Societies, authority, which cannot be where all are equall, must procure unity and obedience.* In his Examin. against the Plea of the Innocent. Observe *Melanthon's* judgement: *As there are some Bishops that govern divers Churches: the Bishop* Centur. Epistolar. Theologicar. Ep. 74.

ſhop of Rome governs all Biſhops. And this Canonicall policy I think no wiſe man doth diſallow: For the Monarchy of the Biſhops of Rome in my judgement is profitable to this end, that unity in Doctrine be preſerved. Wherefore we would eaſily aſſent to this Article of the Pope's Supremacy, if we did agree in other matters.

The ſixth Demonſtration.

Pag. 18.

Libro de unitate Eccleſiæ.

50. If the Apoſtles were *pari conſortio præditi & honoris & poteſtatis*: equall not onely in the ſubſtance of Apoſtleſhip, as power of Preaching, founding Churches, remitting Sins, adminiſtration of Sacraments, and the like: but alſo in juriſdiction and right to govern the whole Church: And if Biſhops be all *ejuſdem meriti & Sacerdotii*, not onely of the ſame merit in order to Prieſthood, but alſo of the ſame degree of authority over others: Then S. *Peter* was not Head of the Church, nor the Biſhop of *Rome* his Succeſſour in that Office.

Ep. ad Evagrium. edit. Pariſ. 1533. tom. 2. pag. 117.

But S. *Cyprian* ſayes the firſt, and S. *Hierome* the ſecond.

Therefore S. *Peter* was not Head of the Church, nor the Biſhop of *Rome* his Succeſſour in that Office.

Whatever *Rigaltius* & others oppoſe,

Now whether your interpretation of theſe ancient holy Doctors be, or be not their true meaning, the Reader may evidently deduce: firſt by what S. *Cyprian* addes immediately to the very words

words above cited, and you very unhandſomely, not to ſay maliciouſly, conceale. *Sed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur.* † *Primatus Petro datur, ut una Chriſti Eccleſia, & Cathedra una monſtretur. The beginning comes from unity. The Primacy is given to Peter, that there may be ſhown one Church of Chriſt, and one Chayre.* And in the ſame Treatiſe: *He that forſakes the Chayre of Peter, upon which the Church is founded, do's he truſt that he is in the Church?* a Secondly from his 71. Epiſtle: *Peter, whom our Lord choſe firſt, and upon whom he built his Church, &c.* Thirdly from his 40. Epiſtle: *There is one God, one Chriſt, one Church, and one See, by the word of our Lord founded upon S. Peter.* Inſomuch that the Centuriſts, famous Proteſtants, reprove *S. Cyprian* for it, ſaying, *Paſſim dicit Cyprianus ſupra Petrum Eccleſiam fundatam, S. Cyprian often ſayes,* b *that the Church is founded upon S. Peter.* c Fourthly from that the ſame Centuriſts d blame likewiſe *S. Jerome* for the like ſayings, who upon the 6. of *S. Matthew*, ſpeaking of *S. Peter*, hath theſe words: *Secundum Metaphoram Petræ rectè dicitur ei: ædificabo Eccleſiam meam ſuper te; according to the Metaphor of a Rock, 'tis rightly ſaid unto him, I will build my Church upon thee.* And in his firſt Book againſt *Jovinian*: *Inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut Capite conſtituto, Schiſmatis tolleretur occaſio. Amongſt the twelve one is choſen, that a Head being eſtabliſht, the occaſion of Schiſme might be taken away.* Which place of *S. Jerome* is alledged by

† See *Pamelius* juſtifying this Text from moſt ancient copies of 800. and 900. yeares paſt, and the ſenſe coheres with all that follows and goes before. *Unum cathedram conſtituit, & unitatis ejuſdem originem ab uno incipientem ſua authoritate diſpoſuit. Qui cathedram Petri ſupra quam fundata eſt Eccleſia deſerit in Eccleſia ſe eſſe confidit?*

a *Vide Epiſt.* 73.

b *As lib.* 1. *ep.* 3 & *l.* 4. *ep.* 9. *&c.*

c *Centur.* 3. *Columna* 84.

d *Centur.* 4. *Columna* 557. & 1250.

Doctor

Doctour *Covell* above cited page 107. to prove the neceſſity of one Head, for preventing Schiſmes and Diſſentions in the Church. Finally, from his 75. Epiſtle, when ſpeaking to Pope *Damaſus*: *Beatitudini tuæ*, ſaith he, *id eſt*, *Cathedræ tuæ communione conſocior, ſuper illam Petram ædificatam Eccleſiam ſcio*, &c. *I am joyned in communion with your Bleſſedneſſe, that is to Peter's Chayre: upon that Rock I know the Church is founded.* Now, Sir, by theſe clear and unqueſtionable Texts is it not manifeſt, that in your Sermon to the Court, you cheated theſe Fathers out of their true meaning?

The ſeventh Demonſtration.

Page 18.

51. If every Patriarch and Biſhop, be appointed to be chief in his proper Dioceſſe, as the Biſhop of *Rome* is the chief in his; then the Pope cannot be chief, or Head of the whole Church.

But ſo it was appointed by the Canons of the two firſt Generall Councils, *Nice* and *Conſtantinople*.

Therefore the Biſhop of *Rome* cannot be chief, or head of the whole Church.

The *Minor* is ſtoutly proved, firſt by the 6. *Nicene* Canon, in which there is not a word of that ſenſe. The Canon is this, *Let the ancient cuſtome hold through Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis, that the Biſhop*

Bishop of Alexandria have power over those Provinces, because that also with the Bishop of Rome, this is usual or customary: that is, to allow that power in the Bishop of *Alexandria*: for if this be not the sense, how could the Judges in the Council of *Chalcedon* inferre out of this Canon, *Omnem primatum*, all primacy in the See of *Rome*, as we shall presently see. The fifth Canon of the second General Council runs thus: *The Bishop of Constantinople must have the honour of Primacy after the Bishop of Rome, because it is new Rome.* Do not those words, *after the Bishop Rome*, rather prove the absolute Primacy of the *Roman* See? Secondly, in the Council of *Chalcedon*, which was the fourth General, *Act.* 16. the Judges having heard the recitall of those two Canons, concluded thus: *By what hath been deposed of every one, we conceive that all Primacy and chief honour, according to the Canons, is reserved to the Arch-Bishop of old Rome.* What Canons, I pray, but those of the two first Generall Councils, you have alledg'd? which are so far from equallizing the *Roman* Bishop with the rest, that they give him all Primacy: that is, both of Order and Jurisdiction. For Primacy of Order alone, is neither all Primacy, nor the chief Honour; Primacy of Jurisdiction exceeding it far. This Primacy is farther proved, because the same Council pretending to grant the Bishop of *Constantinople* a Primacy over the East after the Pope of *Rome*, according to the second Generall Council, expressely addes, that he should have power to order the Metroplitans in the Dioceses of the East;

East: that the Bishops chosen by the Clergy, of whatsoever *Metropolis* of the East, be presented to the Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, that he might either confirm or reject them as he pleased. And both *Theodorus Balsamon* upon the Council of *Sardica*, cap. 3.&5. and *Nilus de Primatu Papæ*, cap. 7. from those two Canons of the second and fourth General Councils, endeavour to conclude a right in the Bishop of *Constantinople* to admit of appeals from all the East. Wherefore your exposition out of *Justellus* concerning primacy of Order alone, is manifestly false, and against the Text. As therefore the primacy aimed at for the Bishop of *Constantinople* over the *East* (but never obtained, because the Church of *Rome* always rejected those two Canons, as derogatory to the precedence of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, established by the first Council of *Nice*:) was both of Order, and Jurisdiction: so much more the acknowledged Primacy of the Pope over the whole Church. Whereupon the Fathers of that Council writing to Pope *Leo*, say, *You presided in this Assembly as the Head to the Members.* When therefore in the same Council of *Chalcedon* it is said: that the Fathers of the Church had given those priviledges to the See of old *Rome*, because it was the Imperiall City: Their meaning is not, that the Cities greatnesse was the immediate cause of the Primacy: For that was the being S. *Peter*'s Successor, as appeares by the Title they gave S. *Leo*'s Epistle in their Speech to the Emperour, τῆς Πέτρου καθέδρας ἀκήκοεν, *the speech of Peter's Chair*: and having read

read that Epistle, thus acclaimed, *Peter spoke by the mouth of Leo*: And in their relation given to Saint *Leo*, speaking of *Dioscorus*, who had dared to excommunicate the Pope in a false Council, called without the Pope's consent, which never was lawfull: *He shewed*, say they, *his malice against him, to whom the custody of the Vineyard was committed.* The Fathers therefore meant *causam causæ*, the remote cause, to wit, the cause why St. *Peter* fixt his Seat at *Rome*, as being the head of the Roman Empire, *to the end*, saith *S. Leo*, *that the light of truth, which was revealed for the Salvation of all Nations, might from the head of the world, be communicated effectually to the whole Body.* And so the Emperours *Theodosius*, and *Valentinian* in a Law made six yeares before the Council of *Chalcedon*, comprehend all the causes: saying, that three things establisht the See Apostolick: S. *Peters merit, who is Prince of the Apostolicall Colledge, the dignity of the City, and Synodicall authority:* that is, Divine, Ecclesiasticall, and Civil right.

Serm. 1. de Apost. Petro & Paulo.

52. The *strict injunction* you mention of the second Generall Council *laid upon Bishops, not to meddle but with their own Dioces* : was not to hinder Hierarchy, but confusion: And so by setting bounds to the other Patriarchs, and omitting the *Roman*, they shewed their respects to that See, as to the Head of all without limit. 'Tis also false, that the Council of *Chalcedon decreed to the Bishop of Constantinople an equality of priviledges with the Church of Rome.* For besides the nullity of that surreptitious Canon, evidently prov'd by Car

nal *Peron* too in his reply to K. *James*, & wholly rejected by S. *Leo*, those Fathers meerly renew'd the fifth Decree of the second General Coucil, which, as we have seen above, intended onely the second place of dignity to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, as is insinuated in the Canon even as it lies, by the words immediately following, which you craftily suppresse, δεύτερον μετ' ἐκεῖνον ὑπάρχουσα, as *being the second after the Roman*. And *Zonaras*, though a *Greek* Schismatick, discoursing of the sense of these words, concludes thus: *from hence it appears manifestly, that the preposition, after, signifies submission and inferiority.* Those words ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equall priviledges*, were afterwards foisted into the Decree by the practice of *Anatolius*, to encrease his power. The Fathers of that Council never own'd them: for when they besought Pope *Leo* to confirm their Canon, they mentioned to him no equall priviledges, but onely said, *We have confirmed the rule of the* 150. *Fathers assembled at Constantinople, that after your Apostolicall See, that of Constantinople should have the second place.* Meaning thereby, that as the Bishop of *Rome* had the Primacy, absolutely and without restraint over all Patriarchs, so the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have it next after him over all the Patriarchs. *Justinian* the Emperour, some seventy yeares after, gives the same sense to that Canon, saying, that *as the holy Pope of old Rome is the first of all Prelacy, so the Arch-Bishop of Constantinople, new Rome should have the second place after the See Apostolick of old Rome, and be preferred before*

In Concil. constantinop. 1. Can. 3.

from Anal. Tomo 3. in Valentinia. jun. & Theodos. fol. 31.

before all the other Sees. Novell. 131. and long after *Justinian* the Emperour, *Basilius* the younger, and *Eustathius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, consisting of a re-union with the Latines; desired, *that it might be lawfull for them to obtain with the consent of the Pope, that the Church of Constantinople might be call'd Universal in the compass thereof, as the Pope of Rome was in the compass of the whole world.* Finally, *Nilus* writing against the *Roman* Church confesseth: b *We are not separated from peace for attributing to our selves the Primacy, or for refusing to hold the second place after the principality of Rome: For we never contested for Primacy with the Roman Church.* Good Sir, where is now your equality of priviledges?

a *Vt sibi liceret cum consensu Papæ, ut Ecclesia Constantinopolis haberetur & appellaretur universalis in suo orbe, sicut Romana in orbe totius Mundi. Glaber Rodolphus l. 1. cap. 1.*

b *De Primatu Papæ l. 1.*

The eighth Demonstration.

Page 19. and 20.

13. Every Pope that refuseth the sole Title of *Universal Bishop*, denies the Primacy of power to govern the whole Church.

But Pope *Gregory* the Great refused the sole Title of *Universal Bishop*; nay utterly condemn'd it,

Therefore he deni'd the Primacy of power to govern the whole Church.

The Major doth so glitter, that it cannot be seen. For first, let the Title be never so true, may not a Bishop out of modesty lay it aside, but he must needs disown the power it signifies? were

not

not the Apoſtles Maſters of the world in regard of their Doctrine, and yet our Lord taught them not to affect that Title? *Be not call'd Maſters, Matth.* 23. 10. Secondly, when a Title hath a double notion, and may for the literal one be uſed in an ill ſenſe: may it not be refuſed, without denying what it imports in the beſt interpretation? St. *Gregory* then conſidering that the Title of Univerſal Biſhop in a ſtrict Grammatical ſenſe, imports *Unum in multis*, one in many, and ſo might ambitiouſly be uſurped, as if there were but one true Biſhop in the world: *If there be one*, ſaith he, *that is Univerſal Biſhop, the other are Biſhops no more*: he utterly rejected it in himſelf, and condemned it in *John* the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. But did he therefore deny or reject the Primacy? did he not inſtance in S. *Peter* himſelf? *Totius Eccleſiæ principatus ei committitur, & tamen univerſalis Epiſcopus non vocatur*. The principality of the whole Church is committed unto him, and yet he is not called Univerſal Biſhop. Doth he not in ſundry places of his works acknowledge this Primacy in himſelf: nay and practiſe it too over the very Church of *Conſtantinople? Quis dubitat? who doubts*, ſaith he, *that the Church of Conſtantinople is ſubject to the See Apoſtolick?* Inſomuch that the Proteſtants *Friccius*, *Carion*, *Peter Martyr*, *Oſiander*, and the Centuriſts cited by Mr. *Breerly* in the Proteſtants Apology, ſhew out of St. *Gregory* theſe particulars: *That the Roman Church appointed her watch over the whole world: That the Apoſtolick See is the Head of all Churches.*

This expoſition is given at large by the Proteſtant, *Andreas Friccius, de Eccleſia lib.* 2. *cap.* 19.

Lib. 4. *Epiſt. Indict.* 13. *Ep.* 32.

Lib. 7. *Indict.* 2. *Ep.* 64.

Tract. 1. *Sect.* 7. *ſubſ.* 9.

ches. That the Bishop of Constantinople is subject to the Apostolick See. That S. Gregory *challenged to himself power to command Arch-Bishops, to ordain or depose Bishops.* This and much more is testifi'd by the Protestants above cited: to which our Doctour *Sanders* addes many other texts: *that all Bishops, if any fault be found in them, are subject to the See Apostolick: that she is the head of faith, and of all the faithfull members. That all those things are false that are taught contrary to the Doctrine of the Roman Church. That to return from Schism to the Catholick Church, is to return to the Communion of the Bishop of Rome: that they are perverse men, who refuse to obey the command of the See Apostolick.*

Libro 7. de visibili Monarchia num. 433. usque ad 541.

These and divers other texts of S. *Gregory's* works so evidently convince his acknowledgement of the Pope's Supremacy, that who should deny it meerly for what S. *Gregory* writ against the name of *Universall Bishop*, seems to me, saith Doctour *Sanders*, *either to have cast off all understanding, or sense of man; or else to have put on the obstinate perverseneße of the Devil.* To decline such a censure, *Calvin* chose rather to confesse, that there is no speech in S. *Gregory's* writings, in which he more proudly boasts of the amplitude of his Primacy then this, *I know not what Bishop is not subject to the See Apostolick, when he is found in a fault.*

Lib. 4. Institut. cap. 7. Sect. 12.

The ninth Demonstration.

Page 20.

54. Pope *Gregory* argues thus against the Title of *Universal Bishop*; if any one were *Universal Bishop*: that is, one immediate Bishop over all Dioceſſes: ſo that other Biſhops were onely his Deputies; there would by conſequence be a failing of the univerſal Church, upon the failing of ſuch a Biſhop; becauſe there would be no true Biſhop to govern the Univerſal Church. *An argument*, ſay you, *ad homines, not eaſily to be anſwered.* Hence is framed this mighty Demonſtration againſt the Pope's Headſhip.

If the Pope is Head of the Catholick Church, then the Catholick Church muſt be the Body of the Pope; becauſe the Head and the Body are the Relative and Correlative, and being ſuch, they are convertible in obliquo.

The Conſequence unavoidably following is hugely abſurd; to wit, *that when there is no Pope at all, the Catholick Church hath then no Head.*

Therefore, *&c.*

What! no Head at all? At leaſt it retaineth an inviſible Head, which is as much as *Proteſtants* allow the Church. It followes onely, good Sir, that in the interval, the Church as Univerſal hath no viſible Head: a thing nothing ſtrange in Politick Bodies. Elective Princes, as the *German* Emperour, and the King of *Polonia*, be they not in Civil Government

vernment Heads of their Princedomes. If they be, the Princedome wants a Head till another be choſen. Is this a myſtery? God govern'd his Church three hundred years without a General Council: may he not govern it a ſhort ſpace without a Pope? eſpecially all other Biſhops and inferiour Paſtors remaining ſtill in full poſſeſſion of their authority over their ſeverall Flocks: and knowing their duty by former definitions of Popes and Councils, interpreting the word of God?

Yea, but when there are many Popes, the Church is a monſter with many heads. True, if with many Popes acknowledged and accepted of by the Univerſal Church, or declared by a General Council, which is impoſſible. Otherwiſe in order to the Faithfull, many Popes, no Pope. In the *interim* 'tis enough for them to ſtick to their known Doctrine, believing in general him to be Pope, who is Canonically choſen, without determining any in particular.

But what if the Pope be heretical? hath not the Catholick Church ſuch a Head, which makes her deſerve to be beheaded? A dainty conceit! Are not the Biſhops of *England* in your opinion the immediate Heads of their reſpective Dioceſſes? what if one amongſt them ſhould turn *Arian*, would not the crime lie upon the Dioceſs, and make her deſerve to be beheaded? no doubt, if you may be believed. And to come nearer your example: you once made *Henry* the 8th. ſupreame Head of the Church of *England*; If holding the Primacy he had faln into Hereſie, durſt you have ſaid that the

gliſh Church had ſuch a Head, as made her deſerve to be beheaded? Doe you not ſee whether this poiſonous Doctrine leads?

The tenth Demonſtration.

Pag. 21.

55. *Some Popes, even by the confeſſion of Papiſts, have err'd* as private Doctors onely, not as Univerſal Paſtours of the Church, never defining hereſie, or commanding heretical doctrine to be ſubmitted unto, as to Divine Truths.

Therefore no Pope is Head of the Church.

Nay, *the moſt zealous and partial aſſerters of their Supremacy*, confeſſe that Popes have been Hereticks, and Heathens too: either by denying the Godhead of the Son, as *Liberius*; or lifting him above the two other Perſons, as *John* the 22. or ſacrificing to Idols, as *Marcellinus*; or being rejected by the Church for the crime of Hereſie, as *Anaſtaſius* the ſecond. Therefore in the opinion of thoſe zealous aſſerters of the Popes Supreamacy, the Pope is not ſupreame Head of the Church. For to what end are thoſe mens authorities alledged, if not to knock down the Pope's Headſhip with our own Clubs.

56. Good God, what a heap of ſubtilties are here maſs'd up, with much more craft, if not malice, then ingenuity? One onely Pope ſubſcribed to S. *Athanaſius*'s baniſhment, communicated outwardly with the *Arians* for fear of torments, but never

never ſubſcribed to the Hereſie it ſelf; never taught, maintained, or defined it. Inſomuch, that not onely *Socrates*, *Zozomen*, and *Theodoret*, but alſo S. *Athanaſius* himſelf in his two Apologies expreſſely ſay, he was no Heretick. Therefore Popes have denied the Divinity of Chriſt.

One onely Pope is without any ground accuſed by *Stella*, as holding the Son greater then the Father and the Holy Ghoſt: No other Writer in the world beſides *Stella* ever charging him with ſuch an errour: no not Calvin himſelf, though he wanted not ſpleen enough to impoſe upon him moſt wrongfully the mortality of the Soul. Therefore Popes have lifted up the Son above the Father and the Holy Ghoſt.

One onely Pope, not for want of faith, but fearing the cruel Emperour's indignation, let fall a grain or two of Incenſe to the Idols, as S. *Peter* denied Chriſt for fear of the Jewes; but ſoon after repenting with *Peter*, died a glorious Martyr. Therefore Popes have been heathens by ſacrificing to Idols, and a total Apoſtacy from Faith.

One ſole Pope was grievouſly ſlandered by the *Schiſmaticks*, adhering to *Laurence* the Antipope, as if he had communicated with *Photinus* an *Arian* Deacon, and would have reinſerted the name of *Acacius*, a furious *Arian*, amongſt the holy Biſhops commemorated in the ſacred Myſteries. And theſe ſlanders once blown abroad by thoſe *Schiſmaticks*, were too inconſiderately, ſaith *Baronius*, regiſtred in the Popes lives. Therefore Popes have been rejected by the Church for hereſie.

Eum integrũ ſyncerumque in Catholicæ fide permanſiſſe, nullum eſt dubium. Baronius 497. in Spondano.

Did ever *Stella*, *Platina*, or *Onuphrius* say so? Do they infer out of the supposed fall of these few Popes among 234. others, that either the Popes were not supream Governours of the Church, or that therefore the *Roman* Church erred in Faith? Doe they not expressly assert the contrary? And that those Popes err'd as private persons only, and not as Heads of the Church? Doth not *Stella* in the very same place adde immediately: *Sed in quantum est caput Ecclesiæ, nullatenus errare potest. But as he* (the Pope) *is Head of the Church, he can in no wise erre*; and that *the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople have often fallen from their faith, but the Church of Rome never.*

57. As for S. *Hilary*, he was not so desperately rash, as to judge the whole Church, except *France*, to be really turn'd *Arian*. For neither *Liberius*, nor S. *Servatius* with sundry other Bishops did ever subscribe to the heretical Confession of the *Arians* made at *Arimini*, though many of the Orthodox Bishops did, partly compelled by fear of torments, partly deluded by the *Arians*, perswading them that the word ὁμοούσιον was omitted, because it was not in Scripture. Hence it is that S. *Basil*, *coetanean* to S. *Hilary* in his 293. Epistle writes thus, *'Twas fitting you should understand, that by the grace of God there be very many that maintain the Orthodox Faith delivered by the Nicene Fathers according to the rule of Piety, and that you are not left alone in the East. For truly the whole West conspires unanimously with*

you. Nay, your Doctor *Boughen* in his Anſwer to *T. B.* confeſſes, that *when Arianiſme prevailed at Rome, the Catholick Church was viſible at Alexandria, in Sardinia, in France, and other places.* Wherefore S. *Hilary* by thoſe words, *à cæteris extra Gallias, from the reſt out of France*; and *inter nos tantùm*; *amongſt us alone*: intended only to extoll the conſtant Faith of his Countrey, for not communicating with the *Arians*, who were ſpread over many other parts of *Europe*. Otherwiſe, he ſaying expreſſely in the ſame Treatiſe, *Epiſcopos Orientales ſtare ſanos*: *that the Biſhops of the East ſtood ſound*, would have expreſſely contradicted himſelf.

58. For the reſt of this your Inſtance, I can only ſay in your words, that *whoſoever ſhall read at large the many liberties and exemptions of the Gallican Church*, which ſtill acknowledges the Pope's Supreamacy; *and the publiſh'd confeſſions of Popiſh Writers touching the Papal uſurpations and right of Kings* (put together by *Goldaſtus* an Heretick, prov'd by *Gretſer*, to be a lying Knave) but never denying the *Roman* Biſhops to ſucceed S. *Peter* in the ſpiritual government of the Church, *will not be able to deny, that the Supreamacy of the Pope hath this* Lying *againſt it, that it was not ſo from the beginning.*

But I muſt tell you with holy S. *Leo*, that *whoſoever denieth the Supream Authority of the Roman Biſhop, cannot diminiſh the power thereof, but puffed up with the ſpirit of pride, plungeth himſelf headlong into Hell.* *Epiſt.* 89. *ſimilia habet* *Epiſt.* 83.

What

What then? have these ten so well contrived Ratiocinations demonstrated nothing at all? yes, Sir, they have demonstrated, that you are still guilty of Schisme for disturbing the See Apostolicks quiet possession of Supreamacy in *England* without a demonstration, that it was usurpt. For 'tis evident from our solutions, that you have not demonstrated such an usurpation. And 'tis no less evident, that an authority of so high a concern for the peace and unity of the Church, so long acknowledged and obey'd in this Kingdome, as of Christs institution, could not without open Schisme be cast out, except it had been denonstratively proved an usurpation.

Against the Infallibility of the Catholick, or Roman Church.

The eleventh Demonstration.

Pag. 22.

No Church can be infallible; to wit, *as well incapable of errour, as not erroneous, except it hath that infallibility, which is one of Gods peculiar incommunicable Attributes. For where there is not omniscience, there must be ignorance in part, and where ignorance is, there may be errour.*

But no Church can have that incommnicable Attribute.

Therefore no Church can be infallible, much lesse the *Roman*.

A high and massy discourse: As if there were

no

no difference betwixt an intrinsecal infallibility proper to the nature of an infinite Being, essentially identifi'd with Omniscience, and an infallibility extrinsecally communicated, relying upon the perpetual assistance of the Holy Ghost, promised by the word of God. Had *Moyses*, and the Prophets Gods incommunicable Attribute? were the Apostles Omniscient? And yet were they not infallible in what they preach'd, assisted by the spirit of God,? was not St. *Paul* as well incapable of teaching the Church errours, as not erroneous, whilest he said to the *Thessalonians*, 1. 2. 13. *Ye received the word of God which ye heard from us: ye received it not as the word of man, but, as it is in truth, the word of God.* And again; *Since you seek a proof of Christ speaking in me*, 2 Cor. 13. 3. Was not the humanity of Christ incapable of errour and sin, as it was govern'd by his Divinity, and could not teach errours? and yet it was not identifi'd with the increated Omniscience of God, nor with the incommunicable Attribute of infallibility. What mean some *Protestant* Doctours, when they grant the Universal Church cannot erre in Fundamentalls? Cannot God preserve from errour as well in not-fundamentalls taken in your sense, as Fundamentalls? If so, that Church so preserved upon Gods promise will be infallible in the sense intended by the *Roman* Church: and then what is become of your demonstration, drawn from the impossibility of the thing? Surely S. *Cyprian* had a better opinion of the *Roman* Church, when he said, *Lib.* 1. *Epist.* 3.

Epist. 3. The Romans are they, whose faith was praised by the mouth of the Apostle, and to whom misbelief can have no acceße. S. *Jerome* had the same sentiment, when speaking to *Ruffinus*, *Know thou*, saith he, *that the Roman Faith commended by the voyce of the Apostle, admitteth no such delusions, and that being fenced by* S. *Paul's authority, it cannot be altered, though an Angel should teach otherwise.*

Lib. 3. Apolog. adverſ. Ruffinum. cap. 4.

60. You and yours on the other side, denying the Church to be infallible, argue Christ of improvidence, in not furnishing his Church with undoubtable meanes to compose differences in matters of Faith, and preserve unity; The Church of Tyranny, in obliging men upon pain of damnation, to believe her definitions, that may be false: and the whole Body of Christians of unsettledness in belief, as relying upon nothing not subject to errour, whether Fathers, Councils, Church, or Scriptures expounded by them. *If I should say, that any one at his pleasure may resist the Councils, I should say well*, saith *Luther*, expressely against S. *Austin's* belief in his first Book against the *Donatists*, chap. 7. who speaking of the rebaptization of those that had been baptized by Hereticks, he sayes, *The obscurity of this question compell'd men of great authority to stagger a long while, untill that in a full Council of the whole world it was firmly decreed, what was most wholsomly to be held, all doubts removed.* Which he could never have said, had he held the Church errable in her Generall Councils. Say what you please, all your certainty

Art. 2. 9. See also *Epist. ad Senatum Iragensem. Decernant Concilia, quidquid velint penes nos erit judicium, &c.*

tainty of Faith is finally resolved into the private spirit, though you cannot endure to be told so,

The twelfth Demonstration.

61. The Tenet of Infallibility upon earth cannot be true, if errours in Faith spring up in the Church.

But *Novatianisme* was hatcht at *Rome*: *Donatisme* spread over the West: *Arianisme* over the East: *Chilianisme* infected the primitive Fathers without contradiction, and the Church of God in S. *Austin*'s and *Innocent* the third's opinion, held the necessity of Infant-communicating, which the Council of *Trent* declared against.

Therefore the Tenet of Infallibility upon earth cannot be true.

62. A sturdy Argument indeed, if one held every single person of the Church to be infallible. Mean while it proves as well, that the Church even under the Apostles was not infallible, for that in their time sprung up the Heresies of *Simon Magus*, *Diotrephes*, *Cerinthians*, *Ebion*, *Nicolaitans*, &c. and yet the Apostles in their Council at *Ierusalem* could freely say, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*. Was not this Council by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, inerrable, notwithstanding those Heresies? How then doe Heresies prove the Fallibility of General Councils, lawfully called, to beat them down? would not such a Principle argue the Fallibility of Christ, because his Doctrine was opposed by the Jewes?

63. *Na-*

63. *Novatianisme* though hatcht at *Rome*, yet the Egge was laid in *Africa*, and this no Author denies. For *Novatus* after a Schisme raised against St. *Cyprian*, coming to *Rome*, joined with *Novatianus* a *Roman* Priest, against Pope *Cornelius*; and both together sowed the heresie held first by *Montanus* and *Tertullian*, that such as were fain should not be readmitted into the Church after repentance. This heresie was presently resisted by *Cornelius* in a Council held at *Rome* of threescore Bishops: in *Africa* by S. *Cyprian* in a Synod of forty two Bishops: at *Antioch* in a Provincial Council. And *Eusebius* addes, that every where through all Provinces the Bishops met against that errour. Finally, the first Council of *Nice* offered peace to the *Novatian*, if renouncing their heresie they would return to the Church. How then do's this heresie, so universally resisted, destroy the Infallibility of the Church?

64. The *Donatists* were but a poor crew in *Africa*, condemned first by *Melchiades* Pope, in a Council at *Rome*, and then by two hundred Bishops (some say six hundred) at *Arles* in *France*: against which heresie S. *Austin* fought gallantly with the Sword of the unwritten word, laying this principle: that, *Quod universa tenet Ecclesia nec Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi authoritate Apostolica traditum rectissime creditur: What is not clearly contained in Scripture, or instituted by Councils, and yet is held by the whole Church, is to be believed to have been delivered by the Apostles.*

Lib. 4. cont. Donat. cap. 24. vide etiam lib. de unitate Ecclesiæ, cap. 19.

65. The

65. The *Arians*, 'tis true, ſpread for a while by power and violence, but were condemn'd by the firſt Council of *Nice*, and by *Julius* Pope, in a *Roman* Council, and by the Council of *Sardica* in *Thracia*, and of *Armini* in *Italy*, and in many other Provincial Councils. Neither did that hereſie ever reach to the breaſt of Pope *Liberius*, as I have ſhewed before. At *Sirmium*, 'tis true, being call'd thither after two yeares baniſhment, he ſubſcribed to the firſt Confeſſion of Faith, in all reſpects Orthodox, except that the word *Homoouſion* was left out, as being new, and not found in Scripture.

66. Of the *Millenaries* there were two ſorts: the one held that Chriſt ſhould reign after the reſurrection for a thouſand yeares upon earth in all carnal pleaſures: of this opinion was *Cerinthus* and his followers: and this is likely to have been condemn'd with the hereſie of the *Apollinariſts*, in a *Roman* Council under Pope *Damaſus*, as *Baronius* records, *An.* 373. againſt which Doctrine *Dennis*, Biſhop of *Alexandria* writ long before, in confutation of *Nepos*, a Biſhop of *Ægypt*. The others addicted thoſe thouſand yeares to chaſte and ſpiritual delights: and of this thought were ſome of the ancient Fathers, but not the whole Church: *For many*, ſaith S. *Juſtin*, *who are of the pure and pious ſenſe of Chriſtians, doe not acknowledge that Doctrine.*

Euſeb. lib. 7. Eccleſ. Hiſt. c. 24.

Dialog. cum Tryphone Judæo.

67. Theſe Fathers were drawn to that opinion by *Papias*, Biſhop of *Hieropolis*, who, as *Euſebius* recounts, ſaid he had it from *Ariſtion* and *John*

Libro 3. Hiſ. Eccl. cap. 39.

John Priests, Auditors of the Apostles: *a Doctrine unknown, and rather fabulous*, saith *Eusebius*; *But for my part, I think he took the spiritual and mysticall Tradition of the Apostles materially according to the Letter, and could not discern what they spoke in figures to sucking Children, & little ones. Who also by the small works he writ, appears to have been of a mean and lesse capable wit.* However this *Chillianisme*, as it was never defined by any General Council, or particular Synod, or any *Roman* Bishop: So with *Cornelius à Lapide* upon the twentieth of the *Apocalyps*: *I dare not say 'tis an Heresie, because I have neither clear Scripture, nor Decrees of Councills, by which it is condemn'd as Heretical.* The same saith S. *Hierome* upon *Jeremy*, lib. 4. Neither do we find it in the Catalogues of old Heresies set down by S. *Austin*, *Philastrius*, *Isidore*, or *Guido Carmelita*. 'Tis in *Epiphanius*, but as relating to *Cerinthus* of a carnal reign.

68. Communion of Infants was never held absolutely necessary by the whole Church. For the ancient Fathers unanimously taught that Baptisme takes away all sin. *Baptisme*, saith S. *Basil*, *is the death of Sin, the regeneration of the soul, the reconciliation of the Kingdome of Heaven.* Nay, *Orosius* in his Apology, S. *Prosper* in his ninth Answer to the *French* Objections, and S. *Fulgentius de fide ad Petrum*, all three Disciples of S. *Austin*, undoubtedly maintain, that Baptism gives salvation and life everlasting. *Hold most firmly*, saith S. *Fulgentius*, *that holy Baptisme sufficeth little*

Homil. 13.

little ones to salvation, as long as their age is not capable of reason. Where it is to be noted, that when Infant-Communion was in use, they were first Baptized, then confirmed, and lastly received the holy Holy Eucharist, as is gathered out of the *Laodicean* Council, held some time before the Council of *Nice*, and confirmed by the Synod of *Trull*, *Innullus etiam sacro Chrismate Divino Sacramento communicare convenit.* And yet both the *Eliberin* Council under Pope *Sylvester*, Can. 77. and S. *Hierome* against the *Luciferans* affirm, that a man dying before confirmation, is saved; and consequently before Communion. Finally, as the Learned Authour of the *Systeme* observes, neither in any of the *British* or *English* Councils, nor in S. *Gregory*'s instructions given to S. *Austin* the Monk, is there any mention of this matter.

Can. 7.

Systema fidei cap. 49 num. 3.

69. As for S. *Austin*, he often attributes a total remission of sins to Baptisme; affirming expressely that Children when they die are either saved by Baptisme, or damn'd for Original sin. Hoc *Catholica fides novit*: *This Catholick Faith knoweth.* And again in his 59. Epistle, *Infants by the Sacrament of Christian grace without doubt appertain to life everlasting and the Kingdome of Heaven.*

De peccatorum mentis & Remissione lib. 2. cap. 2. & de Perseverantia Sanctorum cap. 12.

Therefore that so great a Doctor may not contradict himself, I say with Cardinal *Peròn* his meaning to be, that Infants must either receive actually, or in *voto*; by vow of the Church implicitely contained in Baptisme; For by Baptisme the Child is inserted into the mystical Body of Christ, which mystical

cal Body is represented by the holy *Eucharist*. Now because Christ our Saviour said, that without the eating of his flesh life is not to be had: hence the Saint proves against the *Pelagians* the absolute necessity of Baptisme, not onely to enter into the Kingdome of heaven, as they granted, but also to life everlasting, which they denied. For without Baptisme none can eat Christs flesh, either really, as in persons of due age, or in *voto*, as in Children. This to have been S. *Austin*'s mind, is clearly gathered out of these ensuing words, which venerable *Bede* upon the first to the *Corinthians*, chap. 10. and *Hugo Victorinus*, Lib. 2. *de Sacramentis*, cap. 20. attributes to S. *Austin*, *None must any wise doubt, that every one of the faithfull is then made partaker of the Body and Blood of Christ, when in Baptisme he is made a member of Christ; or that he is estranged from the Communion of that bread, although before he eats that bread and drinks that Cup, he departs this life in the union of Christs Body.*

Serm. ad Infantes ad altare de Sacramento. Exquiem. de Consecrat. Cap. qui pas. sus est.

See also St. Austin l. 3. de peccator: merit. & Remiss. c. 4.

70. The same may be said of Pope *Innocent* the first, who in his Epistle to the Fathers of the *Melevitan* Council, rather insinuates, that Baptisme it self is the eating of Christ's Body. Neither do's *Maldonat* say, that Infant-Communion was either believed necessary, or practised by the whole Church: but onely that S. *Austin* held it as of Faith, and as the Tenet of the whole Church. Nor do's *Maldonat* deny that this very thought concerning Faith and the whole Church, was St. *Austin*'s private opinion.

71. Whence

71. Whence it followes, that albeit the practice in some parts of the Church might have lasted six hundred yeares, yet neither in the whole Church, nor as held for a point of Faith in the whole Church. And if S. *Cyprian* was confessedly received, in holding rebaptization of Hereticks an Apostolical Tradition, and, as S. *Austin* sayes, would have submitted to a Generall Council defining the contrary: why might not S. *Austin* be mistaken in the Traditions of Infant-Communion, and if now living, would humbly submit to the Council of *Trent* defining against it? *Lib. 2. contr. Donatist. cap. 4.*

Against Transubstantiation.

The thirteenth Demonstration.

Pag. 23.

72. *If the age of Transubstantiation may be measured by the very first date of its definition: the Doctrine of Transubstantiation may be allowed to be as old as the Lateran Council, held under Pope Innocent the third, somewhat more then four hundred yeares past.*

But according to you, if ye be serious and doe not triffle, its age may be measured by the first date of its definition.

Therefore the doctrine of Transubstantiation is but somewhat more then four hundred yeares old, and was not so from the beginning.

73. Sir, I suppose you could not chuse but even

 feel

feel with your hands the lightneſſe of this Argument, together with the train of bad conſequences it drawes after it. For hence muſt neceſſarily follow, that no point of Faith can be elder in it ſelf, then the Council that defin'd it. Conſequently the Conſubſtantiality of the Son, the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, the Unity of Perſon in Chriſt, conſiſting with the Duality of Natures, and the unconfuſion of Natures in one Perſon, have no greater antiquity, then the four firſt Generall Councils, by which they were firſt reſpectively defined above 300. yeares after Chriſt. As if the age of Divine Myſteries revealed could not prevent their Conciliary definitions, occaſioned by the emergency of hereſies againſt them. For if it can, why may not the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation have been from the beginning, as well as that of the four Myſteries above mentioned, though its Conciliary definition be much younger?

74. Nay, but *our Lord having ſaid, This is my Blood, explaineth himſelf in the ſame breath by calling it expreſſely the fruit of the Vine.* So was *Eve* call'd *Adam*'s Bone, which then ſhe was not, but had been: & *Aaron*'s Rod, whil'ſt it was a Serpent, ſtill call'd a Rod: and Angels call'd Men, becauſe they appeared like men, though ſubſtantially no Men. But howſoever there ſtill remained in the Chalice the Accidents of Wine, which were truly *genimen Vitis*, a product of the Vine, that word ſignifying not Wine onely, or neceſſarily, but whatſoever growes of the Vine, the Flowers, the Leaves, the Grapes, *&c.* Pag. 9. in the Margin you

you wrong *Scotus*, as if he held Transubstantiation not a point of Faith before the *Lateran* Council, whereas he onely sayes, (speaking of the like Definitions) that it was not explicitely believed under the notion of that word till the Councils definition: *Quæ veritas* (saith he) *etsi prius erat de fide, non tamen erat prius tantum declarata*, Which truth, though it was before matter of Faith, yet it was not before so much declared. Is not this to abuse Authors, and Auditors? *In 4. Dist. 11. quæst. 1.*

The fourteenth Demonstration,

Making the Romanists asham'd of their Doctrine.

75. When two particular Divines disagree in the manner of explaining a Mystery of Faith, but agree both in the truth and Faith of the Mystery it self: then all those that joyn with them in the belief of the same Mystery, *are made asham'd of their Doctrine.*

But Aquinas and Bellarmine disagree in the manner of explaining the Mystery of the Eucharist, and both agree in the truth and Faith of the Mystery it self.

Therefore all that joyn with them in the belief of the same Mystery, as all Romanists do, are made asham'd of their Doctrine.

76. Surely this Demonstration will shame none but the owner of it. A Scholar, and not blush to argue so? How many Mysteries doe Christians believe,

lieve, and yet the greateſt Divines doe ſo claſh in the explications of them, that each party holds the Myſtery impoſſible in the others opinion? We all believe the bleſſed Trinity. Now if one ſhould argue thus? The *Scotiſts* hold the Myſtery impoſſible without a certain diſtinction, which they call *Ex natura rei*, betwixt the Divine eſſence and the three perſonalities or Relations. The *Thomiſts* cry out againſt that diſtinction, as deſtructive of the Myſtery, and importing a quaternity: muſt therefore all Chriſtians be aſhamed of their belief of the Myſtery it ſelf, becauſe thoſe two learned Schools jarre in the expounding of it, or rather he that makes ſo wiſe an argument?

77. But in very deed S. *Thomas* and *Bellarmine* differ not about the manner of Chriſts being in the Sacrament, as you would make your Auditors believe. They both agree that Chriſt is there definitively, all in all, and all in every part of the ſacred Hoſte: which way of exiſting S. *Thomas* calls Sacramental: Their difference is in a Philoſophical Queſtion, whether a Body can be in two places at once circumſcriptively: that is, with all it's local dimenſions, anſwering to the extenſive parts of the place. S. *Thomas* holds it cannot, as implying a diviſion of the body from it ſelf. *Bellarmine* replies with great reſpect to S. *Thomas*: *Hæc ratio, pace tanti Doctoris dixerim, non eſt ſolida. This reaſon (be it ſpoken under favour of ſo great a Doctor,) is not ſolid.* Which having modeſtly ſhown: *Adde to this*, ſaith he, *that if a body cannot be locally in two places, truly neither Sacra-*

menta-

mentally. What is here to ſhame the Catholicks? Where is *Bellarmine's anger*? Where his *revenge* upon the Angelical Doctor? I ſee nothing here but your vanity, ſeeking at the coſt of others wrong to purchaſe applauſe to your ſelf.

78. You ſeem likewiſe to be unvers'd in School affairs, ſeeing that *Bellarmine*'s inference in that queſtion, is common to all Schoolmen, that defend the local exiſtence of a body in two places. Had your intent been, to evince the impoſſibility of the Real Preſence from the croſs opinions of thoſe two Doctors: you might perhaps have argued thus.

According to S. *Thomas*, Chriſts body cannot be locally in two places at once.

But according to *Bellarmine*, if it cannot be locally, it cannot be Sacramentally in two places at once.

Therefore according to both, it can neither be locally nor Sacramentally in two places at once: and conſequently not at all in many Hoſtes.

In this Paralogiſme no aſſerter of the Real Preſence will be ſo ſenſeleſs, as to grant both premiſſes: but if with S. *Thomas* he grant the Major, with S. *Thomas* he will deny the Minor. And if with *Bellarmine* he grant the Minor, with *Bellarmine* he will deny the Major. And ſo nothing will follow inconſiſtent with his Belief.

The

The fifteenth Demonstration.

Pag. 24.

79. If *so long ago as the time of Pope* Nicholas *the Second, either Transubstantiation was not forged and hammered out into the shape in which we find it, nor at all understood by the Pope himself*; then Transubstantiation, as we now find it, is a Novelty invented since the time of *Berengarius*.

But the first is true; becauſe the *submission of Berengarius satisfied the Roman Council of* 113. *Bishops*, without Transubstantiation.

Therefore the second: A masculine proofe! That in the time of *Nicholas* the second, Transubstantiation was not hammer'd out, as it is now believed, we easily grant: becauſe it is as ancient as the time of Christs last *S*upper. But that Pope Nicholas did not understand the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, is a meere forgery indeed, without a syllable of proofe. *Berengarius* was held an Heretick for denying, not the word, but what is signified by Transubstantiation: & in that quality written againſt by the prime Divines of those dayes: In so much that *Fox* confesseth that about the year of our Lord 1060. the denying of Transubstantiation began to be accounted hereſie; and in that number was put one *Berengarius*, who lived about the year 1060. that is, 200. years before the Council of *Lateran*. And *Ioachim Camerarius*

Lanfranck, Adelmannus, &c.

merarius in his Book Intituled *Historiæ Narratio*, pag. 161. *Transubstantionis dogma de evanescentia panis post annum* 850. *tanquam in quieta possessione mansit usque ad Berengarii tempora & annum Christi* 1050. *The doctrine of Transubstantiation of the vanishing of the Bread, after the year* 850. *remained as it were in quiet possession untill the time of Berengarius, and the year of Christ*, 1050.

80. This *Berengarius* twice recanted his errour: first, in a *Roman* Council under Pope *Nicholas* the second, *ann. Dom.* 1059. in which recantation there is not a word of Consubstantiation: for there he acknowledgeth, that after consecration the Bread and Wine are not only a Sacrament (in regard of the species remaining) but also *the true Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour*, into which the substance of Bread and Wine is changed; for the substance of Bread and Wine remaining, cannot identically be affirmed of the Body and Blood of Christ.

81. This to have been *Berengarius* his meaning, is evident by the words of his second recantation under Pope *Gregory* the seventh; *Ego Berengarius corde credo & ore confiteor panem & vinum, quæ ponuntur in Altari, per mysterium sacræ Orationis & verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram & propriam vivificam carnem & sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini Nostri, & post consecrationem esse verum Corpus Christi quod natum est de Virgine, &c. I Berengarius do believe with my heart, and confess with my mouth, that the*

Bread and Wine, that are put upon the Altar, by the Mystery of the holy prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, are substantially converted into the true, proper, and vivifying Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that after Consecration are the true Body of Christ, that was born of the Virgin.

82. Note that he sayes, *the Bread and Wine are substantially converted into the true Body and Blood of Christ*: which conversion, the Council of *Lateran* 136. yeares after expresst by the word Transubstantiation. So false it is, that the Doctrine it self began only then. The Council of *Lateran* was the greatest that ever was held in the Church of God; whereat were besides the Pope, the two Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem* in person; the two of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* by their Substitutes; the first being hindred by sickness, the second by the *Turk*; 70. *Metropolitans*, or Primates; 400. Bishops; 800. Abbots & Priors; The Embassadours of the two Emperours of the East and West, and of the Kings of *England*, *France*, *Arragon* and *Hungary*.

83. Now that so many learned, grave and judicious men of severall Nations, from all parts of the Church should unanimously conspire to forge a Novelty, no man contradicting: nay, that after the Canons of this Council publish'd, all Christians in the world should come to their respective Churches, and fall down to adore upon their knees, what they before believed, to be only Bread and Wine, and a meer figure of Christs Body

and

and Bloud, as *Proteſtants* doe, is a moſt deſperate fancy.

84. Truly the ancient Fathers ſayings in this matter are ſo plain, uſing the words, Tranſmutation, Tranſelementation, Tranſfaction, Creation, and the like, that divers Learned Proteſtants themſelves, cited in the *Proteſtants Apology*, confeſſe a far greater antiquity of Tranſubſtantiation then the Councill of *Lateran*. There you ſhall read, that *Gregory* the great, and *Auſtin* brought into *England* Tranſubſtantiation: that *Chryſoſtome* doth ſeem to confirm Tranſubſtantiation: that *Euſebius Emiſſenus* did ſpeak unprofitably of Tranſubſtantiation: that in *Cyprian* there are many things that ſeem to affirm Tranſubſtantiation: that *Damaſcen* taught Tranſubſtantiation. The reaſon is clear, becauſe thoſe expreſſions of the Fathers import ſome reall change, not in the ſpecies, or outward accidents of the Bread and Wine, which ſtill remain and appear the ſame: therefore in the inward ſubſtance rightly termed Tranſubſtantiation. Thoſe words of *Berengarius* in your Margin, taken out of *Floriacenſis*, if truly cited, ſpeak no intrinſecall impreſſion upon Chriſts Body, but onely an extrinſecal denomination derived from the outward formes of Bread, as S. *Chryſoſtome* expreſt himſelf. *Thou ſeeſt him, thou toucheſt him, thou eateſt him.* So *Abraham* was truly ſaid to ſee, touch, and entertain Angels, for the ſhape they appear'd in.

Printed anno 1608. Tract. 1. Sect. 3. Subdiviſ. 2. p. 82. & tract. 2. Sect. 7. Subdiviſ. 4. pag. 184.

Homil. 60. ad Populum.

Againſt

Againſt the denying the Cup to the Laiety.

The fixteenth Demonſtration.

85. Whatſoever our Saviour Chriſt in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt commanded all his Apoſtles to doe, was likewiſe a command to all Chriſtians.

But our Saviour commanded all his Apoſtles to drink of that Cup he had newly conſecrated.

Therefore to drink of that Cup newly conſecrated was a command to all Chriſtians.

Therefore the withdrawing the Cup from the Laiety, neither was nor could be from the begining.

86. The Argument, to conclude, muſt run thus: and yet it halts extreamly of one Leg: for our Lord by thoſe words πίετε πάντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ, *Drink you all of it*, intended onely that all the twelve Apoſtles then preſent ſhould drink of that individuall Cup he had bleſſed, without powring in, and conſecrating more Wine. This intention of Chriſt is manifeſt: for he ſaid not only, *drink you all*, πίετε πάντες, but having conſecrated the Cup, he ſaid, *Drink ye all*, ἐξ αὐτοῦ, *of it*. Secondly out of S. *Mark*, who addes, *and they all drank of it*. Could all preſent and future Chriſtians drink of that individuall Cup? Thirdly out of S. *Luke*; *Take this, divide it amongſt your ſelves*: Were all Chriſtians commanded to take that very Cup, and divide it amongſt themſelves? Fourthly, Chriſt ſaid to his Apoſtles, *take, eat, and divide*: Were all Chriſtians commanded to take both kinds with their own hands, as Prieſts doe? 87. True

87. True it is, that S. *Paul*, 1. *Cor.* 11. mentions both kinds, and exhorts to receive not unworthily: but commands not both kinds, nay rather insinuates an indifferency, when he maketh this inference: *wherefore whosoever shall eat of this Bread, or drink this Cup of our Lord unworthily, shall be guiltie of the Body and Bloud of our Lord.* So that to receive either unworthily, is to be guilty of both; because in either you receive both. Hence the Apostles addes presently, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgement to himself, not discerning our Lords Body:* Why? but because that in receiving the Body under the form of Bread alone, you receive also the Bloud; which is not separated from Christs living Body. It was therefore so from the beginning. For Christ our Lord, *Iohn* 6. five times promiseth life everlasting to the Bread of life, not mention ing the Cup in those Texts. Himself according to divers [a] Fathers gave the Sacrament in one kind to the two Disciples in *Emaus*. The [b] Apostles practis'd the same, in breaking Bread without naming the Cup; and in your principles, a negative argument from Scripture is valid. The Primitive Church communicated the Sick under the form of Bread alone. [c] S. *Ambrose* dying received in [d] one kind, The Eremits [e] carried the Sacrament to the Desart, in clean Corporals, or Linnen called Dominicalia, there to receive it fasting: & the Christians of *Egypt* kept it in their Houses. *Satyrus*, Saint *Ambrose* his Brother took an Hoste with him in a Box about his neck, to receive at sea. To sucking

[a] S. Hieron. in Epitaphio Paulæ. S. Aug. l. 3. de consensu Evangelist. c. 25. Beda in cap. 24. Luc. Theophylactus. Ibidem Isychius Hierosolim. lib. 2. in Leviticum cap. 9. &c.

[b] Luc. 24. 30. Acts 2. 42. 46. item 20. 7. 11.

[c] Euseb. l. 6. cap. 43.

[d] Paulinus in vita ejus.

[e] S. Basilius ad Cæsaream Patritiam.

[f] S. Ambr. Serm. de obitu fratris. 6. Serm. de Lapsis 6. Concil. Tolet. 11. Can. 11

ing Children the Cup was onely given in S. g Cyprian's dayes. And h in the *Greek* Church they were wont to consecrate the Eucharist onely upon Saturdayes and Sundayes, to be received the other dayes in the week during Lent. Now in those hot Countries the consecrated Wine could not be kept so long. And it is most evident from Antiquity, that the Eucharist was kept under the form of Bread, to be distributed as occasion served. Insomuch that we find amongst the Lawes of *Charles* the great, 800. yeares ago: *Presbyter semper Eucharistiam habeat paratam*, &c. *Let the Priest always have the Eucharist ready, that if any be sick or a Child infirm, he may give them the Sacrament, that they may not die without Communion.* Well then, seeing neither Christ our Lord in the Institution of the Eucharist, nor S. *Paul* in declaring it, excepted any sort of persons, as Sick, Ermites, Children, Sea-passengers, or Christians in Persecution, & yet the Church from all antiquity had power to administer it to such in one kind, and it was ever thought sufficient to salvation, that is, a whole Sacrament, not a Half-Communion, as you terme it: You must then either demonstrate out of Scripture, the Churches restraint to these alone, or confesse her practice towards all to be justifiable. Finally, † *Luther* himself confesseth, that *Christus hac de re nihil unquam præcepit, Christ never commanded any thing in this matter.* And * *Melanchthon* held it a thing indifferent.

g *Concil. Laodic. Can.* 49.

h *Concil. Tyul. Can.* 52.

Lib. 1. *Legum, c.* 160.

† *Epist. ad Bohemor.*

* *In secunda edit. locorum communium: an.* 1525. *fol.* 78. *Argentorati.*

Against

Against restraining the holy Scriptures from the common people.

The seventeenth Demonstration.

Pag. 26.

88. If *Hebrew to the Jewes was the mother tongue, and in that 'twas read weekly before the people.* If the new Testament was first written in *Greek*, because a tongue most known to the Eastern world: and if after some hundreds of years it was translated into a few other tongues for the use of the common people: then the restraining it from the common people was not from the beginning.

But the Antecedent supposition is true.

Therefore the Consequent.

89. Yea, but in our Saviours time *Syriack* was, and had been 14. Generations before, the mother tongue of the *Jewes*, who lost the *Hebrew* in the long captivity of *Babylon:* in so much that *Esdras* reading the Law to them, was forced to use interpreters. The New Testament was in *Greek*, and as S. *Jerome* sayes, read onely in *Greek* all the *East* over; though most of the *Eastern* Nations had a different Language, as it appears by the *Acts* of the Apostles, ch. 2. *How have we heard each man in our own language wherein we were born? Parthians and Medians, and Elamites, and those that inhabit Mesopotamia, Jewry and Capadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphilia,* Nehem. 8. 8, 13.

Egypt

Egypt and the parts of Lybia, that is about Cyrene, and Strangers of Rome. Jewes also and Proselytes, Cretenſians and Arabians. We have heard them ſpeak in our own tongue.

90. Moreover, S. *Matthew* writ his Goſpel for the *Jewes* in *Hebrew*, or in *Greek*, & not *Syriack*, their vulgar tongue: nor is it known that ever the old Teſtament was by order of the *Jewiſh* Church turn'd into *Syriack*. S. *Mark* writ in *Greek* at *Rome*, and for the *Romans*, whoſe vulgar language was *Latine*: ſo did S. *Paul* his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; in *Greek* alſo to the *Galathians*, and yet their vulgar was a kind of *German* Language: *they have a proper tongue almoſt the ſame as thoſe of* Trevers, ſaith S. *Hierome* upon that Epiſtle, *lib.* 2. in his Preface: And if the new Teſtament 400. yeares after, was tranſlated into ſome very few other tongues, what is that to the beginning? were not the common people from the beginning reſtrained from it, at leaſt thoſe 400. yeares, and in thoſe Nations, where *Hebrew*, *Greek* or *Latine* were not the vulgar tongues? And was it then tranſlated by order of the Churches into *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or *Latine*, or put into the hands of the common people, as of neceſſary uſe, or commanded to be read in thoſe new traductions upon that ſcore?

91. Neither is it true, that the *Roman* Church keeps the Scripture from the people; 'Tis at this day extant in all vulgar Languages of *Europe*, and permitted to be read by the Layety with leave of their Paſtours, who are to judge into whoſe hands the

the ſword of the Scripture, which is the word of God, is fit to be put. Which rule, had it been obſerved in *England*, when after fifteen hundred yeares the Bible (except perhaps the Pſalmes) was under *Henry* the 8th. tranſlated into *Engliſh* out of *Latine*, ſo many mad ſects would never have riſen in it.

Againſt publick Prayers in an unknown Tongue.

The eighteenth Demonſtration.

Page 27.

92. What is *ſcandalouſly oppoſite to the plain ſenſe of Scripture*, was not from the beginning.

But the uſe of publick Prayers in a tongue unknown to the common people, is ſcandalouſly oppoſite to the plain ſenſe of Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 14.

Therefore the uſe of publick Prayers in a tongue unknown to the common people was not from the beginning.

93. The *Minor* is undeniable, becauſe you aſſert it; but not a word of proof: which to make good, you muſt demonſtrate firſt, that the Apoſtle by preferring the gift of prephecy before unknown tongues in the Church, the onely intent of that Chapter, ſpeaks of tongues in the publick ſervice, and adminiſtration of Sacraments proper to Paſtours;

ſtours; and not rather and ſolely of tongues in mutual conferences, when the firſt Chriſtians met for edification, to communicate with one another their miraculous gifts, as inſpired Canticles, Prophecies, Tongues, and other graces imparted above Nature, both to men and women in thoſe dayes. In which aſſemblies the *Corinthians* ſeem to have committed ſome diſorders, turning Gods gifts, eſpecially that of tongues, which was the leaſt, to pride and vanity. But in the *Liturgy* or *Publick Service*, which amongſt the *Corinthians* was in *Greek*, there was no abuſe at all, nor occaſion to complain. Secondly, you muſt demonſtrate, that the Apoſtle means every kind of tongue unknown to the vulgar, though known to moſt of the better ſort. For if ſo, he would have contradicted himſelf by writing in *Greek* to the *Romans* a long Epiſtle of Inſtruction. As therefore S. *Paul* cannot be rightly ſaid to have ſpoken to the *Romans* in an unknown Tongue, becauſe *Greek* was known to moſt perſons well bred, though not to the common people: So for the ſame reaſon is not our *Latin* an unknown Tongue in the ſenſe of the Apoſtle. Thirdly, you muſt demonſtrate that the Apoſtle ſpeaks even of Tongues that may be learn'd by induſtry, and not of Tongues divinely inſpired, which neither the Paſtours of the Church, nor the people, nay not the Speaker himſelf did underſtand. And ſo S. *Paul* ſaith in that Chapter, *He that ſpeaks Tongues, ſpeaks not to men, but to God.* And again, *He that ſpeaks Tongues, let him pray, that he may interpret.* Why pray for the gift of interpretation,

pretation, if he understood the Tongues? for so he might of himself interpret by the help of his naturall Language. And again: *If I pray with the Tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is without fruit:* namely, the Spirit that is in me maketh me to pray; but my understanding, not knowing what is said, remaines fruitless. Now that the Apostle did not wholly dislike the speaking of unknown Tongues in the Church, but only preferre the gift of Prophesie (to wit of expounding hard points of Religion) before it; he concludes thus; *Therefore brethren be earnest to prophecy, and to speak with Tongues prohibit not: but let all things be done decently, and according to order, amongst you.*

94. No question but in primitive times the service of the Church was in the three sacred Tongues, Hebrew, Greek, and Latine, as appears by the ancient Liturgies: Hebrew amongst the Jews, though not understnod by the common people: Greek in all the Churches of the East, where severall Nations had a different Language: Latin over the West, (not known to the unlearned, but in *Italy*, and some few *Roman* Colonies) as in *Africa*, *Spain*, *France*, *Britany*, *Germany*, *Polonia*, &c. But when Greek and Latin grew to be un-vulgar in the Nations where they were first naturall; who? where? by what Churches order were the Liturgies translated into vulgar Tongues? read but the modest answer, or Epistle to the boysterous Authour of the Animadversions upon FIAT LUX, and there you shall finde what Pag. 98.

Cyril, Arch-Bishop of *Trapesond* a *Grecian*, answered Dr. *Cosins* at *Paris*, upon enquiry into the matter: to wit; that all the Liturgies, both those of S. *Basil*, S. *Chrysostome*, and S. *Gregory Nazianzen* were ever kept in the Learned Greek, differing from the vulgar Language: and that Masse, or Liturgy was and had ever been the great work of their Christianity all over the *Greek* Church. Some particular persons, 'tis true, after the *Greek* Church was torn with Schismes and Heresies, translated the *Greek* Liturgy into *Ethiopian*, *Armenian*, and some few other popular Tongues; but most of those having by length of time out-liv'd the knowledge of the common people, we may truly averre, that in our dayes all the Churches in Christendome, except some few inconsiderable in regard of the rest, have the publick service in Tongues not vulgar. Take the testimony of your own men, the Authors of that famous Πολύγλωττον, or Bible of many Languages, who in the Preface to their Introduction, Printed *An.* 1655. ingenuously confesse, that *a not onely the Scriptures, but also the Liturgies and Rituals in most of the Sects of Christians are in Syriack, a Tongue unknown but to the Learned among them. That the Jews in publick*

a *Imò non tantum Scripturas, sed & Liturgias & Ritualia apud pleraſque Christianorum Sectas in Syriaca lingua esse, licet doctis inter eos solùm notâ, clarè ostendit doctissimus Breerwoodus. Sic etiam, ut hoc obiter addamus, Judæi in precibus publicis Hebraica lingua utuntur, quam vulgus ignorat. Et Ecclesia Græca, antiqua Græcæ, quæ ab hodernâ vulgari tantum differt, quantùm Italica a Latinâ. Etiam apud Mahometanos ubique lingua Arabica tum preces publicè fiunt, tum Alcoranum legitur (quod profanari existimant, si in aliam linguam transferatur) etiam ubi Arabica est vulgaris. Præfat. ad Introduct. page 37.*

lick prayers use Hebrew, of which the common people are ignorant. And the Greek Churches, the ancient Greek differing as much from the vulgar Greek at this day, as Italian from Latin. And that amongst the Mahometans, prayers are every where publickly said, and the Alcaron, read in Arabick (which they think would be profaned, if translated into any other Tongue) even where the Arabick is not the vulgar Language. With these agrees the Relation of *Alexander Rosse*, in his Review of all Religions. *The Maronites*, saith he, *Cophtes, Jacobits, Georgians, Circassians, and others use a Tongue unknown to the people, in their Liturgies and publick Service.* Sect. 14. pag. 497. Printed 1658.

99. I know no Nation of this age, where publick Service in a vulgar Tongue was ever brought in by the Pope's approbation, as you say. In *China* there are two Languages, one for the Learned, and another for the generality. The Pope onely granted that Masse be said in the Language of the Learned, because Latin sounds very harshly in that Nations eares. If for such like reasons any former Popes have allowed the Translation of the Masse-book into vulgar Tongues, 'tis an argument, that this point of Church Discipline is not indispensable; for the Council of *Trent* sayes only, that *it seemed not expedient to the Fathers, that the Masse should be celebrated every where in the vulgar Tongue*: which hinders not, but that in some places it may be otherwise, if it be judged expedient. However, if God had universally misli- *Paulus Quintus.* Sect. 22. cap. 2.

ked publick prayers for the Church in an unknown Tongue, he would never have ordered, that no man ſhould be in the Tabernacle, when the High Prieſt went to pray for the whole Aſſembly of Iſrael; his Language there being neither heard, nor underſtood but by God himſelf. The load of your Margin weighs nothing againſt our Doctrine. *Origen*, if truly cited, proves onely that every private Chriſtian prayes to God in his own native Dialect. But, Doctour, is *Origen* alone primitive Writers? the reſt you cite, I am ſure are not, nor to the purpoſe.

Levit. 16. 17. *Luc.* 1. 10.

Againſt prohibiting of Marriage to men in Orders.

The nineteenth Demonſtration.

Pag. 27. 28.

96. *In the old Law Prieſts were permitted to have Wives* for continue on the Tribe of *Levi*, of which all Prieſts were to be: but never to uſe them upon the dayes of Officiating, or ſacrificing in the Temple or Tabernacle: though thoſe Oblations were but beggerly Elements, Shadowes, and Figures, as the Apoſtle calls them.

Therefore Prieſts of the new Law, where there is no ſuch reſtraint to Tribe or Family, and where Prieſts offer daily to God the dreadfull Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt Jeſus, may have Wives: and the contrary was not from the beginning.

ning. To corroborate this proof are cited in your Margin, *Thuanus*, a *French* Lawyer, and as it appeares by the whole thread of his Hiſtory, little better then a *Hugonot*, Biſhop *Hall*, a violent Proteſtant againſt Catholicks, and *Zonaras* a *Greek* Schiſmatick. Again,

97. Some of the Apoſtles were married before their calling to the Apoſtleſhip, but after Prieſthood ever abſtained from their Wives, as witneſſeth the ſecond Council of *Carthage*, at which Can. 2. S. *Auſtin* was preſent. *It pleaſed all, that Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons abſtain from Wives, that what the Apoſtles taught, and was obſerved by antiquity, we alſo obſerve.* And S. *Hierome* Epiſt. 50. *The Apoſtles were either Virgins, or after marriage, continent. Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons are choſen either Virgins or Widowers, or ſurely after Prieſthood eternally chaſte,*

Therefore Prieſts may in imitation of the Apoſtles marry, and the forbidding was not from the beginning. Eſpecially if we conſider, how S. *Paul* exhorts even Lay-men to forbear the uſe of their Wives *for a time, that they may give themſelves to Prayer, and attend to the Lord without diſtraction*, 1 Cor. 7. 35. *He that is without a Wife, is carefull of the the things that pertain to our Lord, how to pleaſe God. But he that is with a Wife, is careful of things that pertain to the world*, ver. 32. Should not Prieſts, whoſe calling is above the world, be in a ſtate moſt capable of pleaſing God? What ſort of men be Souldiers to God, but Biſhops and Prieſts, as *Timothy* was, to whom St.

Paul sayes, *No man being a Souldier to God, intangleth himself in the affaires of this life, that he may please him, who hath chosen him to be a Souldier.* What affaires more secular then Wife and Children? who more entangled then Ministers, that, of their Benefices enjoyable onely for their lives, in place of complying with their duties, must provide for Wife and Children? Again,

98. S. *Paul* asserts his liberty to carry about with him ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, a Sister, a Woman, as well as the rest of the Apostles, &c. that is, to maintain him of her substance, or have a care of his Temporals; as our Saviour had been relieved whilest he preached. This meaning is clear both by the Apostles design there expresst of living upon his Trade, to burden no body, and by the interpretation of *Greek* and *Latine* Fathers; who living so near the Apostles time, are rather to be credited then *Luther* and his Brood pleading for Wives. Why doe you against the sense of antiquity turn γυναῖκα into a Wife, the word, especially without an article, importing a woman, whether Wife, or no Wife? else 1 *Cor.* 7. *'Tis good for a man not to touch* γυναῖκα, why translate you a Woman, and not a Wife? The Fathers are St. *Chrysostome, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophilact, Tertullian*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Jerome*, S. *Austin*; cited by *Bellarmin.* Onely *Clemens Alexandrinus* expounds the Text of the Apostle, Wives; but addes, that being Wives, yet lived continent, and were in place of Sisters.

Lib. 3. Stromat. num. 5.

99. The sixth Canon of the Apostles, only orders, that Bishops and Priests, μὴ ἐκβαλλέτω, do not turn

turn off their Wives after Priesthood, leaving them to the wide world, without means to subsist in a handsome way, but rather to provide for them carefully, yet abstaining from carnal acquaintance. This sense is right deduced from the 27. *Canon*, ordering thus, *præcipimus: we command, that if any promoted to the Clergy will marry, they be Lectors or singers only*; And the same is meant of lesser orders. Again,

100. Saint *Paul* saith, 1 *Timoth.* 3. 2. and *Tit.* 1. 6. that *a Bishop may be a Husband of one Wife.* Sir, your own Bible reads, *A Bishop must be blameless, the Husband of one Wife.* In which words, there is neither command nor counsel to have or use a Wife. Otherwise no man wifeless could be made Bishop, without disobeying the Apostles command, or counsel. Yet the words by their tenour sound a precept; but of what? that a Bishop may be a husband of one wife? that's a permission never dream't of by S. *Paul*, not a precept. Is it then, that he must not have, or have had two wives together? that's a Law common to all Christians. If you say, not two wives together before his Conversion; then it follows, that when S. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 9. advises to take a Widow of threescore, having been the wife of one man, he means, not of two men at once, which was never lawful amongst either *Jewes* or *Gentiles*. The true sense therefore is, that a Bishop must not be *bigamus*, or have had more then one wife, before he be made Bishop: And this exposition is wholly consonant to the holy * Fathers, Councils, and practice of the Church.

* *S. Chrys. Hom. 2. ep. ad Tit. S. Ambrose in 1 Timoth. 3. 2. S. Hierome ep. 83. c. 2. & ep. 2. c. 18. ep. 11. c. 2. S. Austin de bono conjugii. c. 18. S. Leo. ep. 87. S. Greg. l. 2. ep. 25.*

Therefore Priests may have wives, and the contrary was not from the beginning. Nay, according to S. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. *'Tis the doctrine of Devils*; because *Saturninus*, the *Gnosticks*, *Manicheans*, and other hereticks, forbid all men both Clergy and Layety to marry, the use of marriage coming *à malo Deo*, *from an ill God*, or the Devil, as they taught.

101. The Fable of *Paphnutius* his pleading in the *Nicene* Council, that Priests, if married before their Ordination, might use their wives after Priesthood, hath been long since exploded by *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, the *Protestants* Apology and others, as being reported by lying Authours, and clearly against the 3. Canon of the same Synod, forbidding Priests to have any women in their houses, but Mother, Grandmother, Sister, or Aunt, who are above all suspition: not a word of a Wife, which certainly would have had women servants to attend her. Yet that very Fable makes against all Ministers, that marry after Ordination: and worthily: for before *Luther*, there is no authentical example of it's lawfulness in the whole world.

Againſt Divorce for other cauſes then Adultery.

The twentieth Demonſtration.

Pag. 29.

102. Our Saviour Chriſt from the beginning confined the liberty of *a perpetual Divorce* (for of this he was askt) to the ſole cauſe of fornication, by reaſon that fornication is properly and *per ſe* or of it's own nature moſt oppoſite to the contract of marriage, violating the faith, and right given to one another.

But according to the Council of *Trent*, a Divorce from bed and board, not perpetual, but for a certain or uncertain time, till the cauſe be removed, may be made for many cauſes beſides fornication, to wit, imminent danger of Soul or Body from either party.

Your frivolous cavil, quoad torum & tarum, deſerves no anſwer.

Therefore the doctrine of the Council of *Trent* was not from the beginning. No,

103. Becauſe forſooth, 'twas not from the beginning, that our Lord promiſed an hundredfold to him, who for his name ſhould leave his Wife, *Matth.* 19. 27. and *Luke* 18. 29. 'Twas not from the beginning, that, if an eye ſcandalize us, that is, according to S. *Hierome*, perſons never ſo dear, as Wives, *&c.* ſhould tempt us very dangerouſly againſt faith, or the Law of God, we were bid to pull it out, and caſt it from us, *Mat.* 5. 29.

104. Does

104. Do's *Maldonat* averre such a separation, though not for Adultery, to be against the Law of Christ? Sir, you most unconscionably slander *Maldonat* and abuse your Auditors, upon perswasion, that he contradicts the Council of *Trent*, in holding sequestration from bed and board, not perpetual, but temporary for any cause whatsoever but fornication, to be opposite to the Law of Christ. Whereas *Maldonat* professedly & at large teaches the contrary, assigning out of the *Canons*, three other causes, as *Sodomy*, *heresie*, or tempting to any grievous sinne, in cap. 5. *Matth.* vers. 32. which you also quote, and so could not misse of seeing your imposture. In the text you cite out of *Maldonat*, he speakes onely of a perpetual divorce, which was the present question, and asserts with our Saviour, that if a man so recedes from his Wife except the cause of fornication, commits adultery, though he marry no other: because if his wife commits it, 'twill be imputed to the husband, as dismissing her unduly.

105. The judgement of *Chemnitius*, a fierce *Protestant*, we value not in this matter. The Scriptures he quotes, are onely effects of the conjugall tye, not the knot it self, which consists in the mutual right of each party to the other; not in the actual exercise of that right, which may be hindred many wayes. Else, if upon businesse the husband be long absent in a forraign Countrey, he dissolves the bond of wedlock, which to assert, is ridiculous.

106. But now, good Doctour, you little think, that

that throwing ſtones at randome with *Diogenes* his Boy, you have hit your Father. Do's not *Luther* your grand Patriarch, allow of a Divorce, not onely temporary but perpetuall, even with leave to marry again, for many other cauſes then fornication? The firſt is, in caſe the Wife be froward, refuſing conjugal right; *Si non vult uxor, veniat ancilla*, &c. *If the Wife will not, let the Maid come: put away Vaſthi, and take Heſter*, Serm. *de Matrim.* The ſecond, if the Husband perſwade the Wife, or the Wife the Husband to any ſin. The third, if a rich woman marry a poor man, and her friends diſapprove the match. The fourth, if the Wife brawle and ſcold, and will not live peaceably, in 1 *Cor.* 7. *Ann.* 1554. *& lib de cauſis Matrim. Ann.* 1530.

Tomo 5. Wittimbergenſis impreſſ. 1554. 113. *item.* *ibid. fol.* 111. *verſ.* 11.

107. *Calvin* in his Inſtitutions huggs the ſame Doctrine of Divorce, with liberty to take another Wife, in caſe one marry without the conſent of Parents: if a Whore inſtead of a Virgin: if either party be abſent a year, or will not keep home after three moneths warning, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 19. And in the *Genevian* Canons, *pag.* 29, 32, 40, 41. *If a husband ſhall be abſent, let his wife cauſe him to be called by the publick Cryer, and if he come not within the time limited, the Miniſter ſhall licence his wife to take another husband.*

Printed anno 1560.

108. But to come nearer home: *Martin Bucer*, a Reader of Divinity in *Cambridge* under *Edward* the 6. whom *Calvin* ſtiles *the moſt faithfull Doctour of Chriſts Church*: The whole Univerſity of *Cambridge*, *A Man moſt holy, and truly Divine*:

vine: Doctour *Whitgift*, *A Reverend, Learned, painfull, and ſound Father*: And Sir *John Cheek*, *Quo majorem vix univerſus Orbis caperet*: *greater then whom the univerſall world ſcarce held.*

109. *Hic vir, hic eſt.* This is the man that profeſſedly argues againſt your expoſition of Chriſts words: to wit, *that as there is at this day like hardneſſe of heart: ſo the diſtreſſed Wives ought to be relieved no leſſe now, then in times paſt: that the Magiſtrate now hath no leſſe authority in this matter then Moyſes had, and at this day ought to uſe the ſame: Neither is it to be believed*, ſaith he, *that Chriſt would forbid any thing of that which his Father commanded: but he commanded the hard of heart, that if they would not uſe their Wives with Nuptiall equity, they ſhould then procure a Bill of Divorce, and marry again.* Out of this principle he deduces many particular caſes, as of parting one from another, Theft, Homicide, Lunacy, *&c.* in which Divorce with freedome to remarry may be lawfull, in *Matth.* 19. *fol.* 147. *de Regno Chriſti lib.* 2. *cap.* 26. 27. 28. 37. 40. 42.

110. And I am credibly informed, that even in *England* Divorce and ſecond Marriage is granted for Frigidity, though contracted after Marriage; in pre-contracts, where no conſummation was; and in caſe either party turns Catholick. However, what more common in the whole Iſland then Divorce from Bed and Board allow'd in certain Caſes beſides Fornication, by the Canons of your Church? Where then is the onely Council of *Trents* hainous offence?

111. *By*

111. *By these therefore, and many more corruptions in point of practice, and doctrine too, which were no deviations from what had been from the beginning*, but wrongfully imposed upon the whole Church united with their Head the *Roman* Bishop, and never *confess'd by the learned'st*, or unlearned'st *Sons of the same Church in their publick Writings*, the sensuall *part of the Christian world was moved to look for a deformation.*

112. What if *Stapleton* laments the vices of some Popes, who sate upon the Chayre of *Peter*, as the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* upon the Chayre of *Moyses*: Did he therefore acknowledge that corruption of manners, either in the whole Church, subject to that See, or that it was ever approved by the Church? S. *Austin* in 116. Epistle will tell you, that *Christ hath placed in the Chayre of Unity the Doctrine of Verity, and secured his people that for ill Prelates they forsake not the Chayre of wholsome Doctrine: in which Chayre even ill men are enforced to speak good things.*

See the like sayings Epist. 165. & contra litteras Petiliani, lib. 2. cap. 51.

113. Now because page 31. you ingenuously confesse, that corruption of manners in point of practice cannot justifie a separation from the *Roman* Church, (and so your Sermon is to no other purpose stuff'd with such pretended corruptions, but to spit your venome at the *Roman* See) [a] I pass over

[a] *Cassander cited in your Margin concludes thus: Non tamen hæc quæ diximus, eo pertinent, ut imagines Sanctorum, si in iis modo decorum servetur, non aliquo honore iis convenienti & debito affici possint.* What I have said, hinders not but that some convenient and due honour may be given to the Images of Saints, if a decency be kept in it.

over what you say of that kinde in the same page, and come to your Demonstrations from corruption of Doctrine, to evince the lawfulness of your Separation. But first I must note, that this objecting humour *Tertullian* observed in the Hereticks of his dayes, and stopt their mouthes with telling them, they were *Vitia conversationis, non prædicationis, Faults of manners, not of Doctrine.* St. *Austin* discovered the same in the *Donatists*, who had *with wicked fury separated themselves from the Roman Church*, and thus takes up the Heretick *Petilian*: *Why dost thou call the See Apostolick the Chayre of Pestilence*, &c.

Lib. de præscript.

Lib. 2. contra Lit. Petiliani, cap. 51.

If we listed to retort, what a large field opens it self in the lives of your Patriarchs, *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Zwinglius*, and others, even from your own Concessions?

See the Protestants Apology Tract. 2. cap. 3. Sect. 9.

Of corruption of Doctrine in matter of Faith.

The xxi. Demonstration.

Page 30.

114. If the *Roman Church's corruptions of Doctrine, and that in matters of Faith, corruptions intrenching on fundamentalls, have been shewed* in the former Demonstrations, then the Schisme is the *Roman* Church's, who gave the cause of Separation, not the Protestants, who did but separate when the cause was given.

But

But the ſaid corruptions of Doctrine have been ſhewed in the former Demonſtrations.

Therefore the Schiſme is the *Roman* Church's, *&c.*

115. No queſtion, if thoſe corruptions of Doctrine have been really demonſtrated, in which appears not the the leaſt glimpſe of evidence, no nor of probability neither: much leſſe concerning corruptions intrenching upon fundamentalls, whereof you ſpoke not a word before, nor ever told us which they were.

116. Why may not all Hereticks in the world by this example pretend to *let out Schiſme, and not to introduce it*? Why not ſtand to it, as you here doe, that the *actual departure from the Church is indeed yours, but the cauſal, the Church's*? Why not that *if a ſeceſſion be made from the Church, 'tis in the very ſelfſame meaſure, that the Church makes one from Chriſt*? As if there could be a juſt cauſe to depart from the *Univerſal Church. We are certain*, ſaith S. *Auſtin, that no man could juſtly ſeparate from the Communion of the whole world*, Epiſt. 48. And again, *There is no juſt neceſſity of dividing unity*, lib. 2. *cont. Parmenia*, cap. 11. And your pretended Arch-Biſhop *Laud* joynes with S. *Auſtin*, *There can be no juſt cauſe to make a Schiſme from the whole Church*, Sect. 21. pag. 139. Now *Luther*, *Calvin*, and all their followers, ſeparated from all the Churches in the world. So *Luther* confeſſeth, *He had none to aſſiſt him; but was left alone, and alone ſtood in the Battell, forſaken of all: Præfat. in* 1. *Tom.* *Solus primò eram, &c.*

&

& contra Regem Angliæ. And for this we have the expresse confession of *Chillingworth*; that *seeing there was no visible Church, but corrupted; Luther forsaking the external Communion of the corrupted Church, could not but forsake the external Communion of the Catholick Church*, &c. cap. 5. pag. 274. So *Calvin*: *it is absurd, that since we have been forced to divide our selves from all the world, we should now in our very beginnings disagree amongst our selves.* Ep. 141. So *Chillingworth*, cap. 5. pag. 237. *As for external Communion of the visible Church, we have without scruple formerly granted, that Protestants did forsake it.* So *Perkins* giving the reason of the Separation: for that *during the space of 900. yeares the Popish Heresie spread it self over the whole world, and for many hundred yeares an universall Apostacy overspread the face of the whole earth.* What else I pray? For if every point of Faith in which we differ from *Protestants*, as Mass, praying to Saints, use of Images, &c. be Heresie and Apostacy; all the Churches in the world besides *Protestants* were both Hereticks and Apostates. And what other sense can that insolent vaunt of *Luther* have in his Letter to the *Strasburgians*: *Christum à nobis primò vulgatum audemus gloriari*: *We dare boast, that Christ by us was first preached.* As if none in the whole world had a right belief of Christ before *Luther*. This, this was really the Doctrine of your first age; though now in the second, many of you for very shame disclaim from it, and seek with Doctour *Usher*, the first *English* broacher

In his exposition of the Creed, pag. 307. anno 1596.

broacher of this new Heresie, in his Sermon at *Wansted* before King *James* An. 1624. to hook in, and matriculate in your Protestant Church the *Greeks*, *Abyssines*, *Ægyptians*, *Jacobits*, though differing never so much amongst themselves, and from you, and holding Heresies expressely condemned in former Councils. You may well affect their Communion, but I am sure they will scorn yours.

117. I said, the first *English* broacher. For indeed this monster of Doctrine fell first from the Apostate Pen of *Marcus Antonius de Dominis*: who to gratifie the Sectaries, forged the distinction of fundamentals, and not fundamentals, and so made up a Church of all Sects in the world agreeing in fundamentals: a Church not to be found either in Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, nay nor any unorthodox Writings of former ages. For what Christians upon earth ever taught before, that salvation might stand with a voluntary disbelief of the least point of Faith known to be sufficiently proposed by the Church, as revealed by God? As if the sin of incredulity consisted rather in the greatnesse of the matter revealed, then in denying Gods veracity, equally engaged in points not fundamentall. *Tom. 3. de Rep. Ecclesiast. lib. 7. cap. 11. Impress. anno 1622.*

118. Yet still Saint *Austin*'s words stand uncontroulable: that *no man can justly separate himself from the Communion of the whole world.* To whom your Doctour *Whitaker* subscribes, *lib. 3. cont. Durœum Sect. 3. He goes*

from the Gospel, who sayes the whole world can conspire against Christ.

119. Yea but otherwise Saint *Paul* had been too blame, in that he said to the *Corinthians*, *Come ye out from among them and be ye separate.* 2 Cor. 6. 17. Very true, if it were the same to separate from known Heathens, and publick Idolaters (of whom Saint *Paul* speaks) who are no Church: and from the whole Church of Christ, against which *the Gates of Hell shall never prevaile.* Neither did the Church thrust you out, as you say, but as Saint *John* fitly termes it, *ex nobis exierunt: You went out from us* by your wilfull errours. *Hæretici in semetipsos sententiam dicunt, suo arbitrio ab Ecclesia recedendo,* saith Saint *Hierome*, In *Epist. ad Tit. cap.* 3. *Hereticks give sentence against themselves, parting from the Church of their own accord.* Nay, but the Church by her hostilities and excommunications departed from you. Yes indeed: just as the four first Generall Councils departed from the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Nestorians* and *Eutychians* by their hostilities and anathemaes, and not rather as Saint *Cyprian* sayes of other Hereticks: *By being excommunicated, they received their due punishment, not cast out by us, but they of their own accord casting out themselves, and wilfully thrusting themselves out of the Church.* Epist. 40. So that if the Devil drive you out, as you confesse, you were your own self-Devils, and not

Pœnas quas meruerunt pependerunt ut à nobis non ejecti, ultrò se ejecerint, & de Ecclesia se expellerent. ep. 40.

not the Church, which excommunicated you.

120. Yet I acknowledge with Saint *Austin*, that *every Christian, who is excommunicated, is delivered up to Satan; but how? to wit, because the Devill is out of the Church, as Christ is in the Church, and by this he is, as it were, delivered to the Devill, who is removed from the Communion of the Church: whence the Apostle demonstrates those to be excommunicated, whom he pronounceth to be delivered to Satan.* In this sense we grant, that the holy Church by Excommunication thrust out Protestants, as the Apostle did the incestuous *Corinthian*, after he had first by that detestable sin given the cause to be expell'd. The Excommunication was the punishment, not the crime. You were once under the spirituall Government of the *Roman* Church, believed her Doctrine, avowed her practises. Of your own private αἵρεσις, or Election, you renounc'd her authority, disbelieved her Doctrine, cast out her practises. Behold Schisme at your door: that is, a voluntary recession from the former Authority, Faith, and Discipline of the Church, for nine hundred yeares acknowledged in the Land. The anathema following was both just, as thundring the offendors, and wholly necessary, to preserve the innocent from your contagion. *Lib.* 11. *qq. cap.* 3.

121. To what you cite in the Margin against *Hildebrand*, or *Gregory* the seventh, *Baronius* hath fully answer'd, *Anno Domini* 1076. 1077.

ſhowing out of approved Authors of the ſame age, that *William* Biſhop of *Maſtrecht*, the chief ſtickler in that Schiſmatical Council at *Wormes*, died a while after in deſpair, roaring out that he was damn'd for adhering to *Henry* the King againſt Pope *Gregory*: and that the reſt of thoſe Schiſmaticall Biſhops upon repentance, both writ to the Pope for pardon, and went themſelves after the King into *Italy*, to be abſolv'd from their Schiſme. He addes, that after the Pope had abſolv'd the King, he ſaid Maſſe, and before Communion taking the ſacred Hoſte in his hand, in preſence of the King and the whole aſſembly, proteſted that he received it as the judgement of the crimes objected againſt him by the Schiſmaticks, that if he were innocent, he might be free'd from all ſuſpition: if guilty, be ſuddenly ſtruck dead upon the place. That then the Pope received very confidently half the holy Hoſte: and after the Peoples loud congratulation of his innocency, he turn'd to the King, inviting him to receive the other half of the Hoſte, as a Canonicall clearing himſelf from the crimes objected alſo againſt him: but that the King pretending an excuſe, declined the tryall. But if all were true that you cite out of *Goldaſtus*, whom *Gretſer* charges with three hundred lyes, 'twould onely prove the misgovernment of one Pope, and nothing at all againſt the *Roman Church*, or Supreamacy of Saint *Peter's* Chair.

122. It

122. In the laſt part of your work, where you ſhould have proved the power of particular Nations to reform the Church in matters of Faith, or after what is ordered by the univerſall Church for the common good, and that by ſeparating from the whole world, as *Luther* did, you name not one Nation, City, Family, or Orthodox man that ever did it, attempted it, or thought of it. To ſooth your Auditours, you rake out of the Channell of ſixteen hundred yeares a few examples in matter of fact, wherein Princes either intrenching upon the immunities of the Church, or aſſerting a pretended right, have ſometimes claſht with the *Roman* Biſhops, or medled *de facto*, in Church affairs: but have they therefore in their ſeverall Kingdomes made themſelves abſolute Heads of the Church immediately under Chriſt, as *Henry* the eighth did, ordering Laymen *Vicar generals in ſpirituality*: As *Cromwell* was, and *ſate in the Convocation-Houſe amongſt the Biſhops as Head over them all?* Did they deny or renounce the Supremacy of Popes in the ſpirituall government of the Church? Have they challenged as born and in-bred to their Crownes, Supream power in all cauſes both Spirituall and Civill? Did they part from the Pope, the Papacy, the *Roman* Church, and all ancient Chriſtian Churches in the world, or ever made Lawes to reverſe the Decrees of Generall Councils in matters of Faith, and not upon that

Baker in Henric. 8. pag. 641

very score been accounted Hereticks? This you shall neither find in *Justinian's Code*, nor in *Zeno's Henoticon*, nor in *Charles* the great's *Capitulars*.

123. The *Code* was compil'd *à nefandissimis hominibus*, by most wicked men, saith *Spondanus*. And that unhappy Emperour, by medling too much against his own rule, in Ecclesiastical affairs, ruin'd his Empire, fell into open Heresie, persecuted Orthodox Bishops, and dyed suddenly. Yet *Baronius* and others very probably judge, that his Lawes concerning the Church were drawn up by *Epiphanius* and *Menas*, Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, but publisht in the Emperour's name for the better observance. For first he often professeth, that in Ecclesiasticall affaires he decreed nothing, but according the holy Canons. Secondly, *John* the second, Pope, in a Letter to him confirmes those Lawes, as being informed by two Bishops, *Hypathius* and *Demetrius*, his Legates, that they were made by the consent of Bishops, in conformity to the See Apostolick, and Decrees of the Fathers. Thirdly, because the Emperour in the *Code*, *Tit.* 1. *lege* 8. sayes, *he will not suffer any thing to pass, concerning the affaires of the Church, which shall not be referr'd to his Blessednesse* (the Pope) *because he is Head of all the holy Prelates*. *Zeno* was a profes'd *Eutychian*, who put out a profession of Faith, call'd *Henoticon*, in which embracing the Faith of

of the three first Generall Councils, he left out the Council of *Chalcedon*. He was in fine buried alive.

124. *Charles the Great*'s respect to the See Apostolick is most renowned in the Christian world. Of devotion to the Church, he caused the Ecclesiastical Lawes to be drawn out of the sacred Councils and Decrees of Popes into 168. *Capitula*, or Chapters, where with much modesty he excuseth himself, saying, that he do's not prescribe Lawes to Bishops, but onely minds them, to see the Decrees of their fore-Fathers observed. There, even as they are in *Goldastus* his third Tome, he sayes, *The Ecclesiastical and Canonical authority teacheth, that Councils must not be held without leave of the Roman Bishop*: there, *that by the incitement of the See Apostolick, and the Council of Bishops, he forbid Church-men to bear Armes*: there, *Ordering that according to the Council of Nice, suits arising between the Clergy and the Layety, be decided in Provincial Councils.* He addes; *Yet without prejudice of the Roman Church; to whom in all causes reverence ought to be kept.* *Constantine* the Great openly profest, *that he could not judge of Bishops.* The designes of the two late Emperours *Ferdinand* the first, and *Maximilian* the second, were ever pious and full of devotion to the *Roman* Church; nor can you show, that at any time, that most Catholick House of *Austria* had the least thought of reforming the Church in points of

Apud Gretserum contra Goldastum, pag. 193. Page 133. Page 137.

Pag. 134.

Ruffin. l. 1. Hist. cap. 2. Concil. Nic.

of Faith, by their own authority. However, they might perhaps by the advice of learned men, propose to the Pope what they thought fit in present circumstances for quieting the Empire. Of twenty Kings of *Juda* some were severely punish'd for intermedling in Priestly functions. Others as Kings and Prophets too, might by Divine instinct reform even in matters of Religion. Others, not without the consent and aid of Priests, destroying Idolatry, restored discipline. But which of them ever undertook a Reformation again the whole *Jewish Clergy*, or by disowning the High Priests authority? Of *Cook*'s fraudulent allegations for our Kings of *England*, see a solid Refutation in *Persons* against *Cook*'s fifth part of Reports, where you shall find all Antiquity speaking the great respect of the *British* and *English* Kings to the *Roman* Church: See also my Lord of *Chalcedon* in the *Protestants* Schisme, Page 36. and the pages following.

125. In a word, Sir, by the whole rapsody of your Marginal Transcripts, you shew onely what was done; but *quo iure, with what right*, not a tittle. If from matter of fact you conclude a power; tell me your sense of this illation:

The Long Parliament outed Ministers, put down Bishops, dissolv'd your Church.

Therefore they had right to doe it.

If you abjure this consequence, to what end such a crowd in the Margin, quoting Histories of

what

what was done, but proving nothing of the ... and power to doe it?

126. Doe the examples of some few secular Princes, unduly handling Church affaires, or actually opposing some exercise of the Popes power, not the power it self, prove the right of particular Nations to reform themselves in matters of Faith, as you pretend to have done in *England*, though you cloak them under the name of corruptions?

127. Hath not the Church ever laid claim to the spirituall government, even with the exclusion of secular Princes, and reserved to her self, as her own inheritance from Christ, the power of managing concerns of Religion? *Hath it ever been heard since the beginning of the world*, saith S. *Athanasius*, *that the judgements of the Church did take their force from the Emperour?* And the renowned Doctour S. *Ambrose* to *Valentinian* the younger, *When have you ever heard, most clement Emperour, that Lay-men did judge of Bishops in matters of Faith?* *Epist. ad solitar.* *Lib. 2. ep. 13.* *See also the Epist. ad Marcellinam Sororem.*

128. 'Tis then an intollerable abuse, to throng and wrest Authours against their meaning, as if they favoured your unjustifiable Schisme, in recounting the deeds of a few Christian Princes, who even then sound in faith, stuck fast to the *Roman* Church, by whose Concession we doe not deny but Princes may sometimes exercise Ecclesiastical jurisdictinn without hurting the Pope's Supreamacy.

129. You

129. You need not put an (*If*) to the matter (*If Sacriledge and Rebellion*) when you speak of your Reformers violent courses. 'Tis too too patent to the world, that the pretended Reformation came in like a cruell Tyrant, waded in bloud, and cut her way through the very bowels of her Mother, the *Catholick Church*, trampling over Crowns, profaning Churches, destroying Altars, violating Vowes, and every where tearing the peace of Christianity. Read *Jerusalem* and *Babel*, or the Image of both Churches, and you shall see this verifi'd to the full. A goodly Brat of Reformation, not to be born but of such Parents.

130. Nay, but the Court of *Rome trod upon Crownes and Scepters*. An hyperbole fetcht from the hornes of the Moon. When? where? what Crownes and Scepters? At least the *Roman* Church made Decrees *with a non obstante to Apostolical Constitutions, not excepting even the Commandements of Christ*. You would perswade your Auditours, that by Apostolical Constitutions, the Pope means Constitutions made by the Apostles themselves: no more, good Sir, then by *Litteræ Apostolicæ* are understood *Letters penn'd by the Apostles*. He meanes Constitutions made by Bishops of the See Apostolick, his predecessours, to whom he being equall in power, may upon occasion repeale their Decrees, as one Parliament can repeale the Acts of another. That, of the non-exception of Christs Commandements, is an empty fancy never dream't

dream't of by the Pope. Was Christs institution of the Eucharist under both kinds, a command to the Layety for both kinds? I have told you before, that your grand Patriarch *Luther* contradicts you.

131. The Imperiall Edict at *Wormes* to set the Church in her wonted posture, you call a *cruell Edict*. But, Sir, you cannot but know, that of late there was a pack of men, who attempted to reform you, crying out, *Down with Lawn Sleeves; down with set Prayers; down with Steeple-Houses.* And in effect much of this was done. By providence the wheel turn'd; Acts and Edicts were publisht to re-establish what you call a Church in her former state. What would you think of such, that should now protest against those Acts as cruel, because they crosse their work of Reformation?

132. When I hear you for a farewell offer us peace upon condition *of being cleansed of our defilements*; me thinks I hear an *Arian*, a *Pelagian*, a *Donatist* say the same to the Catholick Church of their dayes, and in the mean while we laugh in our sleeves. But who can endure to hear you say *the Spouse of Christ is defiled*? Christ has no Church that is not holy, and if holy, undefiled: The staines, the spots, the defilements stick upon you that left her. The Church is for ever *tota pulchra*, *all fair*, and as her blessed Bridegroome tells her, *Macula non est in te*, *there is no spot in thee.* Eph. 5. 27. Canticl. 4.

133. Now,

133. Now, Sir, by what hath hitherto been said, you may peradventure have seen, if passion, interest, or self-conceit doe not blind you, that you neither speak like a Preacher, nor demonstrate like a Schollar. 'Tis the office of a Preacher, to teach, move, and delight: to teach sacred verities: move to holiness of life, and delight with the fair descriptions of Christian duties rnd rewards. You taught indeed, but what? Falsities and Errours: you sent not a word to the heart, nor moved to ought but hatred of truth, and persecution of Innocents: at least you endeavoured it. If you delighted any, 'twas very likely your self, or such as love vanity, and seek lyes, not your best and wisest Auditors.

As to your demonstrative faculty, I appeal to any unpartiall judge, whether a few scraps, or texts of Scripture, torn from their Context, taken upon the credit of the bare Letter, devested of circumstances, wracke, and wrested to the sense of every wild fancy, can ever aspire to rigorous evidence, the sole essence of demonstration. Much less then, a heap of quotations, some falsifi'd, others of open enemies, or suspected friends, none at all precisely to the matter in question. Wherefore 'twas great weakness in you, if not worse then weakness, first to boast of demonstrations against us in your Sermon, and then to cover the shame of your non-performance, tell your reader in the Dedicatory, that your marginall citations are the *evidence and warrant of all the rest*: And why? because forsooth,

ſooth, we cannot *with honour or ſafety contradict the publick Confeſſions of our ableſt Hyperaſpiſtæ.* A pretty piece of Pedantry! *Hyperaſpiſtæ!* Are all your Demonſtrations ſhrunk up to a few quotations of unclaſſical Authours? As if *Polydore Virgil*, and *Eraſmus*, two Grammarians, *Thuanus* a Lawyer, *Caſſander* a prohibited Authour, and ſuch like Riffe-Raffe, were the ſtouteſt Champions of Gods Church. But let us ſuppoſe they were indeed of the ableſt Pens, do's the Catholick Faith depend upon ſingle men's opinions? Are Catholicks obliged upon their honour to defend every particular Doctor's aberrations? Cannot we be ſafe in Conſcience, if we ſtand immoveably to the Scriptures expounded by the Church, and the Definitions of Generall Councils, as the infallible rule of our Faith, but we muſt of neceſſity allow of every private man's ſayings? If ſo, then think, in what a pittifull caſe you are, by declaiming againſt the Novelties of the *Roman* Church, for the antiquity of whoſe Doctrines, a world of prime Proteſtant Writers apologize in the *Proteſtants Apology.* And truly, you that acknowledge no publick infallible authority to decide matters of Faith as we doe, muſt rely much upon your private Doctors; of whom notwithſtanding Mr. *Chillingworth* gives this cenſure in his ninth motive to be a Catholick: *The Proteſtant Cauſe is now, and ever hath been from the beginning maintained with groſſe falſifications and calumnies, whereof their prime Controverſie-Writers are notoriouſly, and in a high degree, guilty.* In this

this judgement he still persevered even after his return to Protestants. For answering his own motives, he retracts it not, but sayes onely that, *Iliacos intra muros peccatur & extra: Papists are more guilty of this fault then Protestants.* We approve as just, this imputation of falsity and calumny laid upon Protestants, but deny his parity as most false, till it be proved.

Now, for a farewell, tell me in good earnest, for the Novelty of what point of our faith have you quoted truly any one of our ablest *Hyperaspistæ*, as you are pleas'd to call them? In what leaf, page, line or margin may we find him? you confess, pag. 31. that Corruptions in point of practice cannot justifie a separation. Well then, amongst the eleven points you object as Novelties, let us set aside the Celibacy of the Clergy, the Communion under one kind, the Scriptures and publick Service in an unknown Tongue: for these concern practice, and are dispensible by the Church. There remain eight other Doctrines of Faith: direct me now to one approved Catholick Author cited in your Sermon, clearly testifying, that the *Pope's Supreamacy*, the *Churche's Infallibility*, *Transubstantiation*, *Sacrifice of the Masse*, *Purgatory*, *Worship of Images*, *Invocation of Saints*, and the lawfulnesse of a *Temporary Divorce* for other causes besides *Fornication*, are all, or any of them, really and truly in their own notions abstracting from the words they are signified by, a meer Novelty, and not revealed from the beginning. This I am sure you can never doe. But if you could, that mans, or mens authority

rity must by your own confeſſion be *the evidence and warrant of all the reſt*: that is, of what ever you aſſert in your whole Sermon.

This then ſuppoſed, can you poſſibly perſwade any rationall man, that the particular authority of one, or more private Doctours, how able ſoever, is a rigorous evidence, convincing the whole *Roman* Church of errour in Faith, and ſuch an evidence, as will in the eyes of God and Man juſtifie a Separation from that Mother Church, though thouſands of others no leſſe able aſſert and believe the contrary? If this be evidently impoſſible for you to doe, as certainly it is, *Da gloriam Deo*, and confeſſe the raſhneſſe of your engagement to demonſtrate our Novelties, and return with ſpeed to the Houſe of God, that Firmament and Pillar of Truth, the *Roman* Church, from which you can never demonſtrate any juſt cauſe to depart. 'Tis the hearty wiſh of

Your humble Servant.

I. S.